

Сергей Кремаёв



Имя России:  
**СТАЛИН**



Sergei Kremlev

**Russia**

**name: STALIN**

Moscow  
"YAUZA"  
"EKSMO"  
2008

Design of the series by artist *P. Volkov*

## **Kremlev**

**S. K 79** Name of Russia: Stalin. — M.: Yauza; Eksmo, 2008. - 320 p.

**ISBN 978-5-699-31565-9**

Despite half a century of total anti-Stalinist propaganda, which during the years of "perestroika" grew into a real bacchanalia of lies, despite unbridled slander, juggling and rewriting of history, the name of Stalin is still popular among the people, as the results of the Internet project undeniably testify to. Name of Russia. Moreover, this time the liberals cannot get away with the usual excuses that "only pensioners vote for Stalin" - mainly young people participate in Internet polls: not the past, but the future of our country. This means that the Stalinist cause also has a future. And although this cannot yet

be called a complete rehabilitation, the attitude towards Stalin is changing for the better before our eyes, a radical reassessment of his personality and his role in history is taking place. The words of his "sworn friend" Churchill are increasingly recalled: "Stalin took Russia with a plow, and left it with an atomic bomb." Iosif

Vissarionovich himself warned that after death his memory and his deeds would be slandered and trampled into the dirt, but in the end the truth would triumph. And so it happened. And today we can say with full confidence: Stalin is the main name not only of the 20th century, but of the entire thousand-year history of our Fatherland.

**BBC 63.3(2)622**

- Dad, is it true that Stalin dined on little fried boys ?

No, son, it's not true! He dined on little fried girls  
kami...

- Well, then I'm not afraid of him!

*Almost virtual conversation of the  
father-"democrat" of the XXI century*

*with young son*

THE REASON that made the author take up the pen (actually, of course, sit down at the computer keyboard) should be clear from the very title of the book. After all, today everyone, perhaps, already knows that the Rossiya TV channel announced the project "The Name of Russia". Moreover, the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (!) and the Public Opinion Foundation are also connected to the project. It was in connection with this "tripartite" project that I had just finished one book about Stalin and decided to write a second about him immediately.

This

one! Because I also want to participate in the project of the Rossiya channel - as best I can ... Initially, the

authors of the project proposed fifty candidates for Internet voting. By September, there should be twelve left.

And from this dozen of names, by the end of the year, the citizens of Russia will have to choose one - my most remarkable, most outstanding, most glorified name, which most accurately personifies Russia of all times and by which Russia

can be proud and boast before the whole world.

The project was announced, and embarrassment soon began - the first places in the rating were steadily occupied by Lenin and Stalin. And then Stalin in general... The scandal in the "noble family" grew... And it grows.

The current "totalitarian" voting results are being discussed by the US Congress, they are being talked about in Europe... Meanwhile, the weekly "Arguments and Facts" through Vyacheslav Kostikov sarcastically reports that the elite Russian public is in shock: what will they think of us in Paris, London, Washington?..

And the same Kostikov declares that "Stalin's highest ratings are a frank popular slap in the face of the current elite, a vote of no confidence in its morality and capacity"...

Well - perhaps, not without this, the "Russian" "elite" has long deserved a slap in the face from the people. However, in reality, everything is even more significant and significant than Kostikov claims.

Moreover, starting with this very letter "Yo", which Kostikov uses in his article in AiF, as I guess, not without reason, but deliberately and defiantly, and which for some time has been generally characteristic of Arguments and Facts.

This, the youngest letter in the Russian alphabet, was introduced into circulation by Catherine II the Great at the suggestion of her friend Countess Ekaterina Romanovna Vorontsova-Dashkova, President of the Russian Academy.

After the October Revolution, the voiced letter "y" was undeservedly removed from the alphabet, along with the Old Slavonic letter "Yat", which really weighed down written speech, a hard sign at the end of words ending in a consonant, and the letter "Fita", borrowed from the Old Slavonic alphabet, according to Dahl, "without need" from the Greek uncial to convey the Greek interdental sound ("theta"). And only in December 1942, Stalin, looking through the materials

prepared for publication in

"Pravda", put dots in them over all the letters "ÿ", and the next day, December 7, 1942, the editorial of "Pravda" came out with the letter "ÿ" twice Catherine's in the title and in the text. On that day, like

every day, starting from November 19, 1942, over the Russian winter steppe under Sta rockets of Russian Guards mortars with the famous name "Katyusha" roared like a lingrad. So - at first glance, bizarrely, but in reality - deeply natural, in a small, but not at all small detail of the life of Stalin's Russia, then the richness of Russian speech, the fate of two outstanding Russian Catherine's, the name of Russian formidable weapons and the NAME OF RUSSIA - STALIN were intertwined .. Now the name of Stalin in Russia, without Stalin

and Lenya would simply not exist today, has been slandered by the enemies of Russia. And it is slandered in such a way that it becomes almost possible that almost virtual dialogue between the "baby" son and the politically idiotic father with whom I began my book.

BUT Stalin himself foresaw THIS when, in a conversation with Alexandra Mikhailovna Kollontai, the then USSR ambassador to Sweden and his old party comrade, he said in the autumn of 1939: "Many deeds of our party and people will be perverted and spat upon, primarily abroad, and in our country too... And my name will also be lied about, slandered. Many atrocities will be attributed to me ..." By the way, as Alexandra Mikhailovna recalled, Stalin

then, reflecting on the role of the individual in history, built his own rating of the glorious names of Russia. He began with the princes of Kyiv, then

he listed Alexander Nevsky, Dimitry Donskoy, Ivan Kalita, Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Alexander Suvorov, Mikhail Kutuzov, and ended - as you might guess - with Lenin.

Well, for an objective citizen of Russia who knows the whole history of his Motherland, choosing *the name of Russia*, it is not easy to choose between Lenin and Stalin.

I will now quote, highlighting it separately, and let the potential participants in the Internet voting in the Name of Russia project try to guess who said it and when.

So:

"... Apparently the 'allies' are going to turn Russia into a British colony," wrote Trotsky in one of his proclamations to the Red Army. And wasn't he right this time? Inspired by Sir Heinrich Deterding (international "oil" king, who lost a considerable number of oil wells in Baku. - S. K) OR simply following the old Disraeli-Beaconsfield program (British Jewish lord, the most active hater of Russia in the second half XIX century. - S.K. ), the British Foreign Office revealed a daring intention to deliver a mortal blow to Russia ... Did the arbiters of European destinies ... hoped to kill with one blow ... the possibility of reviving a strong Russia ... S.. On the other hand, Russian interests were guarded by none other than ... Lenin, who, in his constant speeches, spared no effort to protest against the division of the former Russian Empire.



Well, who rated the Bolshevik Lenin so highly? And when?

Correct

answer: Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich wrote this in the epilogue of his "Book of Memoirs" in Paris in 1933, shortly before his death.

And the uncle of the emperor - the same Nicholas II, who whom the organizers of the Internet project "Name of Russia" are so intensely "inflating" to increase its historically microscopic size, knew what he was writing. By 1917, his nephew brought Russia to the position, if not of a colony, then of the future semi-colony of the West, already because, having plunged Russia into an absolutely unnecessary war with the Germans, he brought Russia's external debt, and before that more than considerable, to breathtaking sizes. Only short-term obligations from international bankers like Rothschild Nikolay collected an amount equal to three pre-war annual state budgets of Russia.

That is, by 1917, Nicholas II, who was so strongly "swindled" by the organizers of the Internet project "Name of Russia" and which I will talk about later, sold Russia to the West three times!

Good "great Russian", nothing to say! And the West knew perfectly well what the Russia of Nicholas II, Mikhail the First, or the Russia of the professors Milyukovs and factory owners Ryabushinskys would become for him. "What we are seeing in Russia is the beginning of a great struggle for her immeasurable resources of raw materials," reported in May 1918 the journal of Anglo-Russian financial circles, Rossiya.

And here is the London financial news estimate in November 1918:

“Events are increasingly taking on a character that testifies to a tendency to establish an international protectorate over Russia in the image and likeness of the British plan for Egypt. Such a turn of events would immediately turn Russian securities into the cream of the international market.

About the same on January 4, 1920, the famous cadet Professor P.N. Milyukov wrote from London to the "white" Don to Countess Panina:

“Now the idea of exploiting Russia as *a colony* (singling out Milyukov. — S.K. ) for the sake of its riches and the necessity for Europe of raw material

catching ... ”.

Does this remind you of anything, dear reader? Such revelations of that and later times could fill a whole book, but these, perhaps, will suffice! Is it worth it to dilute the strong spirit of historical truth with a waterfall of even the most deadly quotations? At the beginning of the 20th century, the "cream of hopes" of the

West for the plunder of Russia turned sour - thanks to Lenin. And by this alone Vladimir Ilyich entered the ranks of the most outstanding Russian people in the entire thousand-year history of Russia. But he also gave Ivan da Marya a chance to avoid the fate of Vanek and Manek, who lived in Russia from time immemorial and who did not know her from time immemorial, and therefore did not appreciate it. Great Russian patriot,  
He said:

“... Learning to work is the task the Soviet government must set before the people.

house in its entirety. We have the material both in natural resources, and in the reserve of human strength, and in the wonderful scope that the great revolution gave to folk art - to create a truly mighty and abundant Rus'. Rus' will become such if it casts aside every despondency and

every phrase, if, gritting its teeth, gathers all its strength, if it strains every nerve, tightens every muscle... tirelessly

over the creation of discipline and self-discipline line, organization, order, efficiency, harmonious cooperation all the people strong forces—such is the path to the creation of power... We do not need hysterical impulses. We need the measured tread of the iron battalions of the proletariat.”

Yes, Lenin gave a great people a great social new chance.

But Stalin implemented it. Lenin

himself once spoke in the sense that a politician should be judged not by what he could give, but by what he really gave. So, Lenin gave Russia a lot and could have given immeasurably more. But he died in 1924, and the work he had not done to transform Russia was done by Stalin.

And it turned out to be huge even compared to the work that Lenin managed to do.

And what about Tsar Nicholas II, who is now being dragged into the "national heroes"?

Well, on the day of the Khodynka disaster, when thousands of people groaned in Moscow hospitals, and thousands of corpses lay in Moscow mortuaries, Nikolai went to a coronation ball in a foreign embassy, for which he immediately received the nickname "Nikolai the Bloody." And on

the day of January 9, 1905, Nicholas the Bloody gave the Russian people Bloody Sunday, and let the current "Russian" historians do not blame his generals. "Coming" always and everywhere

such as his "pop" ...

Lenin, in 1918, "for his friends", for the working Russian people, shed his blood, wounded by poisoned bullets Fanny Kaplan. Nicholas II was

also nicknamed the "Tsarskoye Selo gopher", because throughout his imperial "career" he hid behind a fence of bayonets in the Tsarskoye Selo Palace. And Lenin fearlessly went to the people with

words of truth and was wounded when he spoke to the people, not being afraid of them and despising the threats of the enemies of the people.

The "Tsarskoye Selo Gopher" did not believe in the creative powers of his own people. And this crowned "gopher" in turn was denied the right to faith, all honest and developed Russian people, even from the "tops" of tsarist society. Let's say, Vladimir Efimovich Grum-Grzhimailo is the largest scientist metallurgist of Russia. He was

born in 1864, died in 1928 ... And in 1924 he sent a private letter abroad...

How did a person see the life of his Motherland, who lived fifty-three years of his life in prosperity under the tsars and seven years in severe trials under Soviet power? That's how:

"Let me introduce you to what the Russian people and Russia are now ... Chapters

revolutions...slowly but steadily squeezing and squeezing the public, forcing the idlers to work. Their task is difficult, so difficult that one should be surprised at their patience and endurance. The process is long, painful, but necessary. Whether Russia remains an autocratic state or becomes, to the delight of our "friends", a colony and a colored race, depends on its successful resolution.

for the prosperity of civilized peoples.

During the revolution I lost literally everything I had. I lost my son and nephew in Kolchak's troops. Nevertheless, I do not doubt for a moment that the victory of the Reds and the failure of Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich, Wrangel, and so on and so forth. there is good. The whole nation was sick, from the day laborer to the minister, from the beggar to the millionaire - and, perhaps, the intelligentsia was more infected than the common people. She was a distributor of this infection of laziness and laziness

quality...

I consider the modern system historically necessary for Russia. The Romanov Empire brought up in the Russian people more a disease that ended in an explosion—a revolution. The modern government is slowly but steadily leading the Russian people to recovery. Treatment is always painful, medicine is always bitter, but you must take it and do what the doctor orders. I have always been afraid, and I am afraid even now, that foreign interference will prevent the Russian people from being healed of the

disease that the Russian people fell ill under a stupid

management of the last Romanovs. How  
no matter how hard it is for us, I am quite sure that the hardships  
we are experiencing  
wiya will make us great and brave, kul  
hard working people".

I wonder how Vladimir Efimovich would appreciate  
one of the outstanding - for all time - Russian people, the state of the brains  
of those of his descendants who at the beginning of the 21st century call for  
voting or vote for the "last Romanov"? Vladimir Efimovich himself did not  
doubt, as we see, the greatness of the

historical mission of Lenin and his associates, even when this mission  
was just beginning. But the great Lenin, I repeat, only gave Russia a chance  
for renewal. And it was Lenin's great disciple, Stalin, who created the new  
Russia. Therefore, I am sure: if the metallurgist Grum-Grzhimailo were  
transferred by some time machine to our days and found out how the great  
and courageous, cultured Soviet working people raised

Russia under the leadership of Stalin, then he would not hesitate to  
give his Internet -vote for the most prominent son of Russia - Joseph Stalin.  
And it is unlikely that even such a peculiar contemporary of ours as  
Alexander Minkin, from such a peculiar publication as the Moscow  
newspaper MK, could snipe something maliciously about this.

Oh, MINKINS, oh morals! It is hardly possible to understand the mindset of  
the Minkins, if only because he is clearly schizophrenic. Well, in fact, just  
pathologically hating your homeland and its **Soviet** history, to be either a  
"golden pen", or a "golden pen" in a publication with the title

Moskovsky **Komsomolets!** To hate the Komsomol and one's own Komsomol past - and constantly publish in a newspaper with that name? No psyche can withstand this! Willy-nilly, but with something like that, *you* will get sick ... And so, trying to infect

the whole nation with his sick hatred, from a day laborer to a minister, from a beggar to a millionaire, the "intellectual" Minkin writes about Stalin as a "half-educated", about the "bandit from a young age", about the "executioner", who allegedly brought Hitler to power and "destroyed the agriculture of Russia" ...

Nicholas the Bloody, by the way, to Minkin then not to his liking, and he - a valuable confession - writes that "the last Romanov was an ordinary, weak-willed, narrow-minded (as in the text" MK ", not through" e. - S. K.) gentleman" and "nothing *at all* not made for *ros* these."

There is nothing to argue

with here... But Alexander Minkin is not averse to putting Alexander Pushkin or Vladimir Vysotsky in first place in Russian history, asking: "Why aren't these Personalities the first?" Like,

both "brilliantly expressed the character and spirit Russian person.

What can I say? Apparently, Minkin - after all, the namesake of the bright Russian genius Alexander Pushkin - is not all right not only with knowledge of history (even the most vicious haters of Stal would not dare to attribute Stalin to Hitler's rise to power), but also with a sense of humor ... But with this feeling, everything was

always in order with Alexander Sergeevich himself. And he - especially if he got acquainted with the "brilliant" work of the really often talented Vladimir Vysotsky, would not be offended by comparing himself

with a hoarse singer, but only sincerely - in *Pushkin's way*, would have laughed ... Moreover,

he would have laughed at Minkin's pompous stupidity not only about comparing himself with Vysotsky, but also because of Minkin's attempt to flatter Pushkin's memory by putting him to the first place in the pantheon of Russian history ... Pushkin was not only (and not so much) a poet, but also a thinker, philosopher, and he was well aware of his historical scale. Let's say he was only a singer of Poltava, and Peter was its creator! It was Peter who spoke to his mustaches near Poltava: "Not for Peter, but for the Fatherland, handed over to Peter ..." Pushkin could only sing such a national leader. But try to

be equal to him - thank you! Unlike Alexander Minkin, Alexander Push

kin understood the essence of historical processes.

Alas, Minkin not only does not know his own history and does not understand not only Russian literature, but is also weak in knowledge of the works of modern European researchers that are standard for any qualified journalist. Let's say Minkin declares: "The most famous German on the planet is Hitler (one can argue with this, according to

because the Lutheran name of Luther is rather popular among the Lutherans in the world. - S.K.). But the Germans today would by no means have won first place. He would not even be included in the list. For the Germans, the very idea that their country could have such a name is disgusting ... "

Here Minkin hints that for him, they say, the very idea that the name of Stalin can be a symbol of Russia is disgusting. In refutation of this "hint" about Stalin, surprising in its malice and injustice, I could cite a multitude of opinions not even of Stalin's compatriots, but of foreigners of various political views...



However, in terms of assessments of Hitler in Germany - even by quite respectable Germans - Minkin is impudently ignorant. Take, for example, Joachim Fest. In 1973, he, the editor of one of the

most authoritative German newspapers, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, the winner of many awards for his work in the field of science and culture, including the Thomas Mann Prize, published a thousand-page biography of Hitler, quickly translated into 15 languages. and published in different countries a million

circulations. And

in his Preliminary Reflection to the biography of Hitler, this bourgeois liberal and intellectual wrote the following:

"... If at the end of 1938 Hitler had been the victim of an assassination attempt, then only a few would have doubted that he should be called one of the greatest statesmen among the Germans, perhaps even the consummator of their history. His aggressive speeches ... and his plans for world domination would probably have sunk into oblivion as a creation of the fantasy of his early years and would only occasionally be remembered, to the indignation of the nation, by its critics.

Here, Fest's regret is evident that Hitler did not limit himself to returning to the Reich of the Saarland, the Rhineland, the Anschluss of Austria and the inclusion of the ethnically German Sudetenland into Germany, but broke his head on the very Russia of Stalin, the head of which is in the schizophrenic interpretation of world history A. Minkin - allegedly brought the Fuhrer

to power...

ANY attempt to somehow compare Stalin and Hitler, equalizing them, is not only immoral, but also anti-historical. They are even psychologically incomparable! From his youth, Stalin lived a life that hardened him morally once and for all. Hitler, on the other hand, was formed in an environment not even of bohemians, but of half-lumpen. As a result, Hitler turned out to be a man of stable inner ideas, but without a strong moral core.

Stalin was a mighty cliff against which any storms crashed. Hitler, on the other hand, is a turbulent river, the course of which is determined not so much by herself as by circumstances.

That's why Stalin's Golden West is always hated seen and hates.

This West of the Golden Elite just does not like Hitler, and even then mainly because the Fuhrer could not defeat Stalin's Russia.

Here is confirmation of what has been said ... In 1997, the New York Times ranked the hundred most prominent military leaders of all eras. I don't remember now who was the first there - either Field Marshal Montgomery, or General MacArthur, but Adolf Hitler was number 14 in the New York Times rating. In the second ten there was Peter the Great.

Somewhere in the back - Ivan Konev and Georgy Zhukov.

But for the one who ***for five years ruled the world's greatest war***, who defeated Hitler and led Konev and Zhukov, places in this "rei

tinge" was not found at all.

Why?

Yes, just because the convinced, outstanding Bolshevik Stalin is the number one military leader of all times and peoples!

No one else in the history of the world comes close had to organize gigantic military efforts of a huge power and its troops, interacting to act with allies, to take strategic decisions in the conditions of constant lack of time, in a rapidly changing situation, and at the same time not to lose the political and economic leadership of a great country.

And at the same time, think not only about its future, but do not even forget about the return to Russian literature of the sonorous and at the same time charmingly feminine letter "Yo" ...

Even Lenin, I repeat, had more modest tasks! Not to mention, for example, Napoleon ... However, not only Napoleon, but even his Marshal Marmont got into the rating. Although Marmont, on the scale of modern warfare, would dangle somewhere between the levels of corps commander and army commander. And Stalin alone had more than a dozen fronts, and the number of armies exceeded fifty!

Only one person - his opponent Hitler - was forced to solve problems of equal scale and nature, but he ultimately did not solve them. And Stalin decided! Alexander Minkin reports that in an

English poll similar to the one started by the Rossiya TV channel, or rather, which became the prototype for the Rossiya TV channel, Churchill took first place, and declared

No, it's a "very clear solution." Actually, for someone who knows the latest world history, this decision is not so obvious. Churchill was one of those who deliberately, in the interests of the United States, first dragged England into the First World War, as a result of which England turned from a world creditor into America's debtor, and then into the Second World War, as a result of which

the British Empire collapsed, and the British lion himself found himself in the position of a cur in the backyard of Washington.

But to hell with him - with Sir Winston! Even during the war, as prime minister, he did not get out of bed until noon - he drank tea, read letters, received clerks and ministers. Not even in a dressing gown "steered" warring England, but in a nightgown, out of bed!

Yes, if at least a tenth of Stalin's military problems suddenly fell on him, then "Englishman No. 1" in this very "leading" bed right there, sorry, would have described himself!

And Stalin? Today, his appearance is falsified utterly! Here, for example, is the book of two not only genetic, but also "spiritual"—if one can speak of spirituality here—twins Zhores and Roy Medvedev, Unknown Stalin. Published without indication of circulation in 2001 by a certain publishing house "Human Rights" ... Its two authors, two nimble brothers - "historians" have long been playing at objectivity, and in their book they even admit that Stalin was "an undoubted patriot of the historical Russian statehood", that he had "tremendous will, great industriousness and considerable (yes! - S.K. ) intellect"... However, these are Pharisees' "praises". The

Medvedev brothers - an amusing, by the way, surname in the history of Russia - already in the preface define Stali as "a leader, a dictator and a tyrant." Well, Stalin really was a leader, but in his nature there were no traits of either a dictator, or, even more so, a tyrant. Although, in general, **the real** Stalin rose above any usual assessments to a greater extent than anyone else.

Stalin, of course, met all the requirements of a political genius - starting with an outstanding memory and the ability to quickly and accurately enter into questions that were new to him. However, he was not just a great politician, but a social reformer. And a social reformer does not need a pronounced genius akin to Beethoven's or Newton's. He must be a kind of "all-rounder", and here Stalin turned out to be as strong as anyone before him! True, he had almost no one to compete in this category, because outstanding reformers, driven solely by

the interests of the working majority of mankind, are almost unknown to history. Marx, Engels, Lenin, well, maybe - Mahatma Gandhi ... And Stalin. His characterization, left to us by Alexandra Lvovna Tolstaya, is interesting. The daughter of the "mirror of the Russian revolution" left Soviet Russia in 1929. On paper - to Japan, temporarily,

with a series of lectures. According to his spiritual inclinations - forever, taking with him (also "temporarily") a collectible guitar made by Krasnoshchekov in 1828. Tolstaya reacted to Soviet Russia viciously. In this sense, one can speak of Alexander Tolstoy as a "mirror of the Russian intelligentsia." Standing in the middle of her Yasnaya Polyana, she did not see behind the fallen old "trees" and stupidly

did not want to see the young undergrowth of the new Soviet "forest". She was more loyal even to  
rism, when - as she stated in her memoirs - her father's books were published for the common people in supposedly millions of copies.

And precisely because of Tolstoy's anti-Sovietism, what she wrote about her only meeting with Stalin is valuable for its psychological authenticity:

"In appearance, Stalin reminded me  
a non-commissioned officer from the former guardsmen or a  
gendarmier officer. Thick, as only military men of this type wore,  
regular features, a narrow forehead, a stubborn, energetic chin,  
a powerful build and absolutely not Bolshevik courtesy. When I

left, he got up again and walked me to  
doors."

And I'm thinking: "And how would she vote in the project of the Rossiya TV channel, after everything that has happened in Russia and with Russia since her "temporary" departure from Russia?"

It would be SUCCESSFUL, perhaps, to think in general: "What if, after getting acquainted with the history of Russia over the last, say, three hundred years, all generations of the Russian and all other peoples connected with Russia by a common historical destiny took part in the voting within the framework of the Rossiya TV channel project? What would be the outcome *of such* a vote?"

Well, to answer this question, one must say at least a little about the Russian people themselves ...

The Russian people are a great people, and once again we proved this by the fact that, without major conquests, they spread almost peacefully from the Arctic to the Pamirs, from the Carpathians, from the Baltic and Black Seas to Eastern Siberia and the Far East, and even had their own - Russia! — America. Moreover, the Russians did not just spread, but

shallow to repel all external invasions, so much so that with the course of centuries Russia only grew

stronger. But all outstanding events, all periods in our history show and prove that for Russia it is especially significant what constitutes its supreme power and how this power guides.

it does.

If smart patriots are at the head of Russia, it gains strength and perspective. If

mediocrity and "Ivans, not remembering kinship", the country is weakening and decrepit.

Alas, in Russia the second happened more often. And very often her supreme power was unworthy of the people who were subject to her. But even in such periods of confusion and vacillation, Russia was strong in the initiative and vitality of the most glorious part of her popular masses. The English say that

there are, as it were, two English peoples, differing from each other even in outward appearances—a squat, unrestrained common people and a well-proportioned, lean aristocracy. So, in the Russian people,

but in the whole people, both in the very thickness of its mass of the people, and in its upper layers, there are two peoples fundamentally different from one another - the people of Ivan and Marya and the people of Vanek and Manek. And I emphasize: Vanek and

Manek have always had enough even at the very "tops" of Russian society. Moreover, in these circles they always prevailed.

The first people beat foreigners, the second people licked their heels.

The first created melodious, soulful songs nor, the second - obscene ditties.

The first in a difficult time frowned, pulled up his belt and rolled up his sleeves, the second played the fool.

The second lived anyhow, not very interested even in what is there beyond the distant forest. The second strove to lie down on the stove, and the first ... And the

first went to distant lands - not conquering them, but organically absorbing them into the circle of Russian affairs. It was precisely the movement of the nation... The West sent predatory adventurers to overseas possessions, then missionaries, and only then administrators, colonists.

And the Russian Ivan, the son of Ivan da Marya, went to the new lands of Western, Central, Eastern Siberia immediately as an exponent of the general Russian will - due to the breadth of character. And even if he seemed to be following yasak and "soft junk", then - in the end - he was following the fate of the Russian land.

Not everyone has understood this to this day, and not everyone has understood it for a long time. For example, a very intelligent Russian man, Nikolai Alexandrovich Berdyaev, wrote in his time:

"The dimensions of the Russian state were set almost impossible tasks for the Russian people... And this has left a bleak stamp on the life of the Russian people... The Russian people have no creative play of forces. The Russian soul is crushed by the vast Russian fields... The vast expanses of Russia have fallen like a heavy burden on the soul of the Russian people... The vastness of the Russian spaces did not contribute to the development of self-discipline and self-activity in the Russian man... The Russian soul is bruised by the expanse..."

Like this! Someone looked at the world from Peter's "window to Europe" and saw from it the future mighty Russia. And someone, as we see, glanced at Russia from the "window" of their intellectual reflections and did not



understood that the very vastness of Russian spaces was the result of the active initiative of the best part of the Russian people, the result of their calm movement into the world! They would

say to Yaroslav the Wise, Holy World of God, Ilya Muromets with Dobrynya Nikitich and Alyosha Popovich, Alexander Nevsky with Dimitri Donskoy, Ivan IV the Terrible with Yermak Timo Feevich, Afanasy Nikitin, Semyon Dezhnev, Yerofey Khabarov, Khariton Laptev, "bombardier" Peter the Great, Mikhail Lomonosov, Alexander Suvorov, Ivan Kruzenshtern with Yuri Lisiansky, Ferdinand Wrangel, Nikolai Muravyov Amursky, Gennady Nevelsky, Dmitry Mendeleev and millions of Ivan and Mari, that the Russian soul was bruised (!) by the breadth ... I think that they were at first they would simply not understand that this is being said about their souls, and

when they would have understood, they would have asked - perhaps with anger, and possibly with laughter: "And you, dear man, did your mother accidentally hurt you when you were a child? » And if the Russian soul was bruised with bloody bruises, it was the idiocy of

the rulers, who were absolutely unworthy of this Russian soul. Like it is today.

A thousand years ago, Russia in the dark and poor then Europe was called Gardarik - the country of cities. And there were more than four hundred of them in Rus'! Cities of the rich, cheerful and festive, working with people smart and skillful.

They say that our ancestors were unable to govern and called on visiting Varangians to the kingdom ... This is a lie! Yes, the Varangian Rurik came to us from half-starved Scandinavia for rich Russian honey and bread, but he came to **be hired**, as they were hired

several centuries later, in Italy, the commanders of the condottieri ... And, I must say, Rurik and his descendants honestly worked out their bread, serving the new Rodi not not for fear, but for

conscience ... And Rurikovich, the Russian Grand Duke Yaroslav the Wise, gave his daughters to European kings: Anna - for the French Henry, Elizabeth - for the Norwegian and Swedish Harald, Nastasya - for the Hungarian Andrey. And those considered it an honor to take the Russian

princesses for themselves. Six hundred years have passed, the great Russian Tsar Peter ended up in France. And there he was shown the Reims Cathedral, where the French monarchs, and holy relics used at coronations. Among them was an ancient sacred a book written in an unknown language, to which the French queens have sworn from time immemorial.

Peter took the book and began... to freely read the old Russian "Psalter", which the French queen Anna Yaroslavna brought with her to France, where her *illiterate* husband from the Russian capital city of Kiev ruled... Yaroslav the Wise,

by the way, in the same pores founded the Russian city of Yuryev in the land of Estonians - the current university city of "sovereign" Estonia Tartu.

There were, however, leaders in Rus' and stupid, greedy, eager for civil strife and quarrels. In 1097, at a congress in Lyubech, the grandchildren of Yaroslav the Wise divided Kievan Rus among themselves into separate estates. As you can see, among the Gorbachevs, Yeltsins and subsequent Yeltsinoids, "ideological" predecessors are found in a very distant past - in 1997, the 900th anniversary of the ancient "Belaya Vezha" already fell.

And soon the Russian land fell under the Tatar-Mongolian boot for three hundred years. A story that would do well for us to remember.

But even at that time, if a real leader stood over the Russian people, things were going well. And on the ice of Lake Peipus, under the Russian sword of the Russian prince Alexander Nevsky, European dog knights.

The time has come, blessed by St. Sergius of Radonezh, under the banner of Demetrius of the Don, the Russian people on the Kulikovo field began to break Ma May's army and the hateful yoke.

With Ivan Kalita, with Ivan III, not just the expansion of the Russian state to its natural borders began, but an expansion deliberately initiated at the highest state level, that is, initiated and encouraged by the head of state . Ivan the Terrible was first called the autocrat, "the king of all Rus"

in 1547 ... As a true Russian patriot, he was slandered both during his lifetime and after the grave. But when, at the end of his life, on his orders, the clerks compiled a martyrology of all those killed on Ivan's orders, in order to atone for the king's sins, the final list did not include even five thousand people. But during the reign of Grozny, one St. Bartholomew's Night of 1572 in Paris alone cost the French tens of thousands of lives. Under Grozny, the Russian inheritance expanded, Russian lands were gathered under the arm of

Moscow. But again the Troubles and boyars' strife broke out among us.

And again the Russian land shook. In 1610, the Polish garrison entered the Moscow Kremlin to lodge: not only Ivan Susanins were our ancestors, there were also traitors.

A story that would do well for us to remember. However, peoples are not strong by their traitors, but by heroes. Kozma Minin raised Nizhny Novgorod, and there the whole of Russia rose. And beyond the ocean ... sorry, - Polish proteges flew out of the Kremlin after  
by their owners.

Less than a hundred years had passed, and in 1709 Peter's eagles, together with the first warrior of the new Russia, the great Peter, defeated the Swedish king Charles XII near Poltava. And another

interesting story happened to Peter: he took as a trophy the sword of Charles, which was presented to the Swede by the King of Poland August. And Augustus also received it as a gift, and also from his ally, Tsar... Peter. The traitor Augustus, a few years before Poltava, entered into

a secret alliance with Karl behind our backs in Altranstadt, and as a sign of his "loyalty" (or betrayal?), gave Karl a gift of Peter's sword. Soon after Poltava, Peter and August met again, and the Russian tsar, having forgiven the unfaithful king of Poland, casually inquired: where, they say, is my gift? And he presented the "new" sword, which was taken from the battle from the Swedes, to Augustus, who had begun to scream. This is what happened to us, Russians, history -

### ***under such and such leaders!***

Russian iron of the Ural factories with Siberian sable on the brand was valued higher in Europe  
Swedish.

Russian naval commander Fyodor Ushakov used such tactical formations that even Admiral Nelson never dreamed of. Russian soldiers beat

Frederick the Great and entered Berlin. Our Suvorov defeated that same Moreau  
whom Napoleon himself envied.

French travelers were surprised  
the density of the Russian peasants...

Surprised, of course, and another. During the

First World War, representatives of the French artillery, metallurgical  
and chemical industries said: "We are surprised that you are turning to us  
for assistance. Your Petrograd factories alone are far superior in their  
capacity to the entire Paris region. If you would take any action to

use of your industrial resources, you would leave us far behind." This was  
written by a former Russian military agent in France, a

former chamber page of the last Russian Empress, Count Ignatiev,  
Lieutenant General of the Workers 'and Peasants' Red Army. He also wrote  
this:

Russia has long paid dearly for its  
technical backwardness, presenting a tidbit for foreign industry:  
no investment of capital, one sale of patents for the latest  
production methods

instructions and technical drawings, as  
bore the loud name of "technical assistance", it was possible  
to take any profits from Russian factories ... "Technical  
assistance" was one of the most reliable means for turning  
Russia into a colony ... "

Words that would not hurt to know and remember  
us today.

STALIN knew Russian history very well, and when he  
once said that Tsarist Russia was beaten every now and then,  
did not mean to humiliate the Russians, but just remind

nal to the commanders of the Red Army and the whole country that the old Russia over and over again paid dearly for its technical backwardness, for its inability to mobilize its resources, for the distrust of the authorities in the strength of the people.

Stalin also knew the people very well - he himself came out of it and already in his youth began to lead the struggle of the masses, and spent the last three years before the revolution in the deaf Siberian "looms", where, for all the small number of inhabitants, food for observation of the people's character, in his both attractive and disgusting features, there was enough.

I will talk about these years and about the young Stalin, but in order to finish with the theme of the old, pre-Leninist and pre-Stalinist Russia, let's get ahead of ourselves ...

On May 9, 1945, the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the Nazi invaders ended. And it was possible to compare the course and results of the two world wars that fell to the lot of Russia. World War I... At the head of Russia is one of the

contenders for the first place in the Rossiya television rating, Emperor Nicholas II.

I'm not talking about the fact that this "Russian" succumbed to all the provocations of the anti-Russian forces and allowed Russia to play against Germany - the only natural partner of Russia in the arena of world politics and economics. One way or another, the war has not begun. And it seemed to start successfully for Russia - Samsonov's army badly battered the "German" in East Prussia. The top leadership of the country, including the emperor, did not

experience any psychological shock from the start of the war.

experienced, because there was nothing unexpected in what was happening - Russia was even the first to announce mobilization!

The industry of Russia that started the war had every opportunity to work without interruption at full strength - during the entire war, not a single German or Austro-Hungarian bomb or projectile fell on any of Russia's strategically important industrial or military facilities. And all of them remained intact throughout the war. Completely - throughout the war - is preserved (for small losses in Poland) - in general, the entire economic potential of Russia. Moreover, from the very beginning of the war, the Germans were forced to fight on two

fronts, because from the very beginning of the war, that *Russia* had powerful allies. And then ... And then, when the war got further developed, Russia was trampling on its

borders, gradually surrendering its territory, albeit marginal, but still its own territory: Warsaw, Riga ... At the same time, Russia was falling apart more and more, increasingly climbed into foreign debts.

And she no longer

enough resources.

And most importantly, they lacked that moral spirit, which, according to Napoleon's accurate assessment, correlates with the material factor as three to one. It is significant that during the years of *that* war not a single significant work of art was created - only "Pineapples in champagne, pineapples in sham

pansky ...".

And as a result of the war, the tsarist Russia of Nicholas II collapsed - shamefully and ingloriously!

Now let's look at Soviet Russia, at Stalin's USSR... According to the assurances of the eternally dissatisfied "Russian" "intellectuals", this was not a country, but a gloomy concentration camp, the "commandant" of which was the "executioner" Stalin.

And now the insidious and strong enemy inflicts on this "colossus with feet of clay" a powerful, territorial and material scope, an unprecedented military blow earlier in history. The front is falling apart,

entire formations are being taken prisoner. The enemy is rapidly occupying millions of square kilometers of the country's territory. Many representatives of power shamefully flee to the east, leaving everything to the mercy of fate. In some places the Germans are greeted with bread and salt... "Tyrant"

Stalin and his "satraps" are on the verge of collapse. Control is lost. Outside help is small, there are no active allies, there is no second front. A significant part of the country is occupied, part is under bombardment... Even the capital is

bombed, and the second capital is under blockade. Thousands

of the most important industrial enterprises are either lost due to the occupation, or destroyed, or evacuated to the east. Coal production fell from 165.9 million tons in 1941 to 75.5 million tons in 1942. Steel production fell from almost 15 million tons in 1940 to 4.8 million tons in the same 1942, pig iron - from 18 million tons to 8 ... And then ... And only then - when the war developed further, Russia

powerfully

went forward, taking spans, crumbs, and then ...

And then already reaching "Europe"!

This new Soviet Russia was able during the war to recreate such a powerful economy that gave the army tens of thousands of tanks, self-propelled artillery mounts, hundreds of thousands of aircraft, artillery pieces! And what tanks!



What guns! This

Russia has become a single military camp. Not in words, but in deeds, she lived with the call "Everything for the front, everything *for* the Victory!". This Russia created outstanding works of art during the war: symphonies and genuinely folk songs, novels and

news, poems and plays...

This Russia even built new metro lines and stations!

And what

stations! During the

war, she even restored the Catherine's letter "Yo". She defeated the enemy

and came to Berlin, casting a medal from military bronze for his capture, and for the capture of Budapest and Vienna, and for the liberation of Warsaw, Prague, Belgrade. As a result of World

War II, which became Russia's second Patriotic War, Russia finally took shape as a great superpower. What glory! What a result! And what a contrast compared with the results of the one

the first, "tsarist" war ...

Knowing all this, would Peter the Great have voted for Nicholas II? Or even - Catherine II of paradise? After all, she was also a patriot of Russia, she called her "the Universe" ...

To whom would Alexander Nevsky, Alexander Suvorov and Alexander Pushkin, Dimitry Donskoy and Dmitry Mendeleev, Ivan Surikov and Ivan the Terrible, Pyotr Bagration and Pyotr Tchaikovsky, Mikhail Lomonosov, Mikhail Kutuzov, Mikhail Lermontov, Nikolai Gogol and Nikolai Lobachevsky give their votes? Monarch Romanov or Bolshevik Stalin? Bard Vysotsky or Generalissimo of the Soviet Union?

Khrushchev, who, in a fit of frankness, somehow confessed to the participants in the plenum of the Central Committee that all of them, together with him, are not worth the Stalinist city, or to the one whom Khrushchev betrayed and slandered,

attributing to him the leadership of the war on the globe? And for whom, I wonder, would the last crowned Romanov himself vote? He was a weak-willed man, but still you can't call him the last bastard ... Somehow in his own way, ugly, but he also loved

Russia ... In 1944, in the Urals, in Stalin's "Tankograd", 74-year-old academician Paton wrote an application for admission to the

CPSU (b). Here is what he wrote:

"When the Soviet government took control of our country into its own hands, I was already 47 years old. Having worked for many years in the middle of the capitalist system, I assimilated its worldview... I considered the undertakings of the new government to be unviable... When I got acquainted with the plan of the first five-year plan, I did not see the possibilities for its implementation. Time passed, work on the Dneprostroy began, which was in no way given to the former authorities. I began to understand my mistake as new construction projects were carried out ... My worldview changed more and more. I began to understand that what brings me closer to Soviet power is that work, which is the basis of my life, is put above all by the Soviet power. I was convinced of this in practice... The outbreak of the Great Patriotic War was a brilliant confirmation of the power and steadfastness of the Soviet system. Passed before my eyes

the last two wars—Japanese and imperialist. I had the opportunity to thread the situation then with what is happening now, during the Patriotic War. I am amazed at the endurance and heroism with which the Soviet people are fighting on the fronts and in the rear under the firm leadership of the Party and the Soviet government....

But the assessment of Stalin's Russia and Stalin himself from the

outside ... Major-General Friedrich Wilhelm von Mellenthin was an enemy, but an intelligent and experienced enemy: he fought in Poland, in France, in the Balkans, in Africa, on the Eastern Front, and then again in France, in the Ardennes and in Germany itself ... He ended the war as chief of staff of the 5th Panzer Army in the Ruhr pocket. In 1956, his book "Panzer battles 1939-1945", published in our country in 1957 ("Tank battles 1939-1945"), was published in London, where he wrote:

The Russian soldier loves his "mother Russia", and therefore he fights for the communist regime, although, generally speaking, he is not a political fanatic. However, it should be borne in mind that the Party and its organs wield tremendous influence in the Red Army. Almost all commissars are urban dwellers and come from working class backgrounds. Their courage borders on recklessness; These people are very smart and determined. They managed to create in the Russian army what it lacked during the First World War - iron discipline... Discipline is the main trump card of communism, the driving force of the army.

missions. It was also a decisive factor in Stalin's enormous political and military successes... ..The skilful and persevering work of the communists led to the fact that since 1917 Russia has changed in the most amazing way. There can be no doubt that the Russian is increasingly developing the skill of independent action, and the level of his education is constantly growing ... "

General Mellenthin wrote that the Russian infantry "fully preserved the great traditions of Suvorov and Skobelev", that the Russian artillery "is a very formidable branch of the army and wholly deserves the high appraisal that Stalin gave it," that the tankers of the Red Army "were tempered in the crucible of howl we" that "their skill has increased immeasurably" and that "such a transformation must have required exceptionally high organization and unusually skillful planning and leadership"...

At the same time, Mellenthin stated: "The Russian high command knows its business better than the command of any other army." After all,

this is said primarily about Stalin! And the fact that this is said specifically about him, more convincingly than anything else, is confirmed by the fact of that deep respect for Stalin's military leadership talent, the respect of the younger in scale for the elder, which the chivalrous Konstantin Konstantinovich Rokossovsky always showed towards Stalin - crystal honest and the best Soviet commander during the Great Patriotic War. Moreover, Stalin led the war not only at the front, but also in the rear. And

what was this rear of the new

Russia can be judged, for example, by the confessions of the famous German aircraft entrepreneur and designer Heinkel. Soviet aircraft designer A.S. Yakovlev wrote that the fulfillment of Soviet orders in the early 1930s forced Heinkel to sharply improve technological discipline and factory control methods. "I thought," Heinkel wondered, "that I had a great plant, but more wikis work better."

"Russian" "democrats" put candles in front of the images of "innocently murdered by villainous Bolsheviks" of "Saint" Nicholas II...

But the greatness of the Russian State was ensured by the era of Stalin. And it provided it not at the expense of the Gulag, barrage detachments and fear, but at the expense of the creative, creative forces of the people, headed by Stalin for thirty years.

LET'S MAKE one more comparison... Let's take periods of two decades, falling on the times when such historical figures as, for example, Peter the Great, Nicholas the First, Alexander the Second, Nicholas the Second and... And, of course, Stalin were at the head of Russia .

So..

Russia Peter.

The year 1700... The shame of the first Narva, the smirks of Europe, the complete absence of modern science and mindset...

By 1710: St. Petersburg was founded, Narva was taken, the Poltava victory was won... Russia is of European importance, the first Russian newspaper Vedomosti is published, industry is booming... The navigational school prepares Russian national  
footage...

By 1720: Russia is a maritime power with its own shipbuilding, which won the glorious Battle of Gangut in 1714, and the Battle of Grenchen in 1720... Russian landings reached Stockholm, setting the penultimate victorious points in the Northern War... Russia already has a very powerful industry. The prerequisites were created for the establishment in 1724 of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences...

The Russia of Nicholas the

First... 1834: The peasantry is in a "fortress"... Nicholas foolishly intervenes in the "Eastern question", but nevertheless the Unkiar-Skeles Russo-Turkish treaty, which is advantageous for Russia, is concluded... Science and industry develop slowly ... In 1836, the emperor - according to the memoirs of the engineer Delvige - said his famous: "I do not need scientists. I need performers ... By 1844: The peasantry is in the "fortress" ... Nikolai continues to interfere in the "eastern

pros", industry is developing slowly ... Foreign policy is in the hands of Nesselrode, Russia

is mired in a quagmire of external debts, preparing for to give his California possessions in America... The outstanding Russian chemist Nikolai Zinin synthesized aniline in 1842 by the reduction of nitrobenzene, but he does not have serious state support... By 1854: At the cost of even greater foreign

debts, Russia suppressed the European revolution of 1848-1849. .. The peasantry is in a "fortress", industry develops slowly, neglect of the construction of railways has acquired a criminal character and in many respects programmed the disgrace of the Crimean War.

## The Russia of Alexander II...

1860: Russia is unacceptably slow and with little success trying to overcome the all-round crisis caused by the Crimean War, and is preparing for the "liberation" of the peasants in 1861 from above in view of the threat of this reform being carried out from below...

By 1870: Still underdeveloped in science and industry, Russia loses its fantastic geopolitical prospects, worthlessly selling its huge possessions in North America... Only the Turkestan policy of securing Central Asia for Russia can be called relatively successful... Baron Lionell Nathan Rothschild became a financial agent of Alexander's government... By 1880: Having carried out the Balkan campaign of 1877/78, which was excessive from the point

of view of Russia's national interests, Russia finally gets stuck in external debts, having tripled them in a few years! Industry, science and technology are depressingly insufficiently developed... The well-being of the people absolutely does not correspond to the resources and capabilities of Russia. The technical level of the army and especially the navy as a whole is still low.

## The Russia of Nicholas II...

1894: Beginning of the reign... Russia is being "drifted" towards the Anglo-French in the form after blowing it against Germany. The penetration of foreign capital into Russia takes on a massive character, the Russian oil-bearing regions are taken over by Nobels ... By 1904. In the short term - the

shame of Tsushima and defeat in the Russo-Japanese War; "one hundred Lypin ties" - gallows garrotes; loss of half of Sakhalin ... The atmosphere in the whole society on

hardened by the injustice and mediocrity of power from top to bottom...  
The level of economic development is still catastrophically behind the level of the leading powers, although in terms of gross indicators, Russia is among their top five. Half of the population

of the country is illiterate, the system of state public education is virtually non-existent.

By 1914: Foreign debts have acquired the character of bondage, and the influence of foreign capital is already almost colonial in nature ... The Russia of Nicholas II is on the eve of an unnecessary war for it, which will lead it to a total catastrophe.

In the new history of tsarist Russia, one can distinguish  
pour only a quarter of a century that fell on the developed Petrine era, when the life goals, attitudes and efforts of the highest national leader are highly  
coincided with the vital, fundamental  
national interests... "Petrov's

daughter", "merry Elizabeth", more  
she had fun, although she did not prevent her subjects from serving Russia, occasionally even encouraging them. But - nothing more ...  
Catherine the Second - a

German who became Russian, glorified Russia, and with it herself, was inconsistent in her service to Russia ... Aging

an autocrat, at the end of her life she finally became entangled in the intrigues of her rogue lovers.

Her son Pavel - by no means half-crazy and not a monster, as he is often imagined, was killed by the current "perestroika" by order of the British, without having had time to do much of what he had planned. But even if he succeeded, he would not, of course, be compared even with Peter ...

About the rest, not mentioned here, Russian monarchs after Peter have nothing to say.



But what a shame - both in post-Petrine Russia of the 18th century, and in Russia of the 19th - early 20th centuries, that is, in the times of three Alexanders and two Nikolaevs, the people of creators, the people of Ivanov and Mariy, did not disappear ... He lived at the top of society, lived downstairs...

So, there were quite a few people in the privileged or educated strata who even then served Russia faithfully, intelligently and successfully ... Military commanders Rumyantsev, Suvorov, Kutuzov, Bagration, Skobelev, administrators Mordvinov, Yermolov, Inzov, Golovnin, Muravyov-Amursky, chemists Butlerov, Markovnikov, Mendeleev, Borodin (the latter was also an outstanding composer), metallurgists Sobolevsky, Anosov, Chernov, engineers Vyshnegradsky, Zhuravsky, Lodygin, Slavyanov, Schilling, Shukhov, Yablochkov, navigators Krusenstern, Lisiansky, Bellingshausen, Lazarev, naval commanders Kornilov, Nakhimov, Makarov, gunsmiths Gadolin and Mosin, explorers of the new lands of Wrangel and Nevelskaya - this is only a small part of the representatives of the humanly and professionally wealthy tops of Russian society from the times of only the last five Russian emperors. Their names are human and professional

worthy contemporaries from the people in history almost not survived ... Dasha Sevastopolskaya, sailor Koshka, a few more names, and, perhaps, that's all ... But they were, these nameless great sons and daughters of Russia - heroes of the development of the Far East and Russian America, the defense of Sevastopol and Petro - Pavlovsk-Kamchatsky, artisans of Russian Diesel and Sormov, proletarians of Putilovsky and the Baltic

factory...

However, Russia Alexandrov and Nikolaev did not really need the people of Ivanov and Mariy - it was more

The people Vanek and Manek were more suitable, just as he is also suitable for the "elite" of the current "Rossiyanin".

But Stalin's Russia would have been simply impossible without reliance on the great people of Ivan and Marya! And so let's look at two decades from the history of Stalin's Russia...

1930: The first five-year plan was started, but many projects are almost frustrated, breakdowns of valuable equipment are typical already during the start-up period ... The "great turning point" in the countryside led to the fact that half of the cattle and horses were suddenly put "under the knife" by the peasants. Russia is once again at a crossroads...

By 1940: The USSR is the second industrial power in the world with an unprecedentedly dynamic economy and a powerfully growing large-scale cooperative agriculture. The national education system has ensured the rapid development of national science and technology, Russia is turning into a country of students... Western Ukraine and Belarus, the Baltic States, Bessarabia have been returned to Russia...

And another Stalinist decade - the first

post-war...

1946: Russia won a difficult war, regained all of Sakhalin and the Kuriles... However, its entire European part is in ruins, and although during the war Russia's economic potential even increased in some respects, the country's situation is extremely difficult, the level the well-being of the people is low, in a number of regions many people live under the threat of starvation ... Russia is threatened with nuclear destruction

matching...

By 1956: The country has changed both externally and in terms of its socio-economic indicators!

Hunger and devastation are forgotten... The power of the state is growing year by year... Although the bulk of the population still lives modestly, all honest, hardworking people look to the future with confidence and reasonable optimism. The prestige of education and the desire for it are enormous, and the opportunities for education for all citizens - with the desire and ability - are real. Russia is a thermonuclear and missile power, which in a year will send the first artificial Earth satellite into space... This is what Russia could do under the

leadership of the first figure in Russian history, Comrade Stalin .

Yes, formally, for the last three years of this decade, Russia has already lived without Stalin, and the last year of the decade saw the beginning of his Khrushchev defamation... However, will even Alexander Minkin venture to assert that Russia's successes in 1954-1956 were not prepared by the era of Stalin?

BUT WHEN did it begin, this era? Perhaps it began along with the conscious life of Stalin himself. But if so, we need to turn to his years

becoming.

After all, we all really come from childhood. In front of me is a book in a strict dark cherry binding with a title ousted by faded gilding: "Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. Short biography". The second edition, corrected and supplemented... The book was signed for publication on January 16, 1947, circulation - 1,000,000 copies.

This is the only decently published biography of Stalin in the USSR, which is opened by the best, perhaps, of all photographic portraits of the still young Stalin. There is nothing ceremonial, official in it -

the standing collar of the famous jacket is unbuttoned ... And the face ...

Looking at him, I once wrote: In this look

- the era, Until the last  
breath. And she is not  
small ... She looks  
from afar On the

essence of that  
era,  
Saying: "Well, on the way!"

About the beginning of the era, much later called the era of Stalin, his official biography reports  
So:

"STALIN (Dzhugashvili) Iosif Vissa ionovich, was born on December 21, 1879 in the city of Gori, Tiflis province. His father, Vissarion Ivanovich, a Georgian by nationality, came from peasants in the village of Didi-Lilo, Tiflis province, a shoemaker by profession, later a worker in the Adelkhanov shoe factory in Tiflis. Mother - Ekaterina Georgievna - from the family of a serf peasant Geladze in the village of Gambareuli . In the autumn of 1888, Stalin entered the Gori Theological School. Stalin graduated from college in

1894 and entered the Tiflis Orthodox Seminary the same year .

My book, dear reader, does not belong to the biographical genre. The main goal of the author is to show the role and place of Stalin in the history of Russia and the world. And all the information related to the biography of Stalin, which I cite, is subject to this OS.

new goal. That is why I will try to limit myself to the most necessary minimum of biographical details and will select them so that they do not

they simply introduced the reader to certain events in the life of Stalin, but showed his historical scale. But is it possible to understand the historical scale of even the most

outstanding historical personality, known to all, if we are ignorant of its human scale?.. Someone from

great once remarked that a novelist endows its protagonist with significance, intelligence, talent, bright originality, and the story is more illegible in this respect - it takes the one who is at hand. It is witty, but it is true about many "historical" figures such as Grishka Otrepyev, Mishka Gorbachev, Thiers, Kerensky, Truman, Yeltsin and his Yeltsinoid afterbreaths. However, the above thought is true only in relation to history, but not in relation to History with a capital letter ... This - Big - History brings to the fore in outstanding historical epochs such real figures, the appearance and

fate of which the fantasy of the most talented novelist will envy ! Macedon and Caesar, Charlemagne and Yaroslav the Wise, Louis XI and Ivan the Terrible, Henry IV and Peter I with Catherine II, Napoleon and Bismarck, Mahatma Gandhi and Castro - you can write a fascinating novel about each of them, the main character of which will be interesting and is significant primarily as a person, as a person, and not as a historical character .. What can

we say about Lenin, about Stalin! Their faithful and complete psychological portraits, for all

integrity and purposefulness of the natures of both, should contain many tones, halftones and a complex, dialectical mixture of various edges

juice and shades.

But my task does not include the intention to give a detailed psychological portrait of Stalin. And if I touch on this side of the issue, then the same thing is in connection with the main goal: to show not just the outstanding role of Stalin in Russian history, but the role that cannot be canceled first - even in comparison with Lenin. However, how can we do without "psychology" at all? And it also starts from childhood.

About the childhood years of those who entered History, having come to its "mezzanine" from the social "attic", there is always a lot of fiction and speculation, but little accurate information. And a fable about childhood Lina, if desired, can be read in abundance. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the childhood of young Soco Dzhugashvili was not easy because he was born into a poor family. But the first years of his life were certainly not beggars, because - according to the later public testimony of Stalin himself - his father was not just an excellent shoemaker, but the owner of a small shoemaker's shop. Having gone bankrupt, he returned to work at Adelkhanov's shoe factory, but dreamed of returning from the proletariat to the petty-bourgeois society.

standing...

American political scientist, professional diplomat Robert Tucker wrote in 1973 one of the most interesting foreign studies about Stalin. At the same time, Tucker, so to speak, "honestly" did not understand either the essence of the Stalin era or the role of Stalin in it, for nothing that from the second half of the 40s and almost until the middle of the 50s he lived in Moscow and even married in 1946 in Russian. AND

It is quite typical that Tucker gives information about the Gori years of the young Soso based on the book of Stalin and the tragedy of the Georgians, Stalin and the Tragedy of the Georgians, published in 1932 in German in Berlin by a certain namesake of Stalin, Iosif Iremashvili. Iremashvili studied with Coco Dzhugashvili at the Gori Theological School, later became a Menshevik, and with the establishment of Soviet power in Georgia - an emigrant. It is impossible to neglect his positive information about Stal - Iremashvili really knew Stalin well in childhood. But it would hardly be reasonable to accept as reliable almost all the negative information about the life and nature of Coco coming from Iremashvili. The fate of Stalin's namesake, as well as the time and place of the publication of his book, turned out to be too specific to believe the bad things that a Menshevik émigré wrote about the General Secretary of the Bolshevik Party. Well, actually! On the one hand, Irema Shvili claims that the Coco apartment has become his

second home. On the other hand, he writes that at home, Coco always had drunken scandals of his father, accompanied by beatings of his wife and son. But it is unlikely that one Coco would remain willingly visiting another Coco, if this were the case. Stalin himself, in a conversation with the German writer Emil Ludwig, said briefly: "My parents were uneducated people, but they treated me quite well ..."

And what can we say about the "information" of Edward Radzinsky, who refers to the "memoirs" of a certain Khana Moshiashvili, a 112-year-old (!) Georgian Jewess who moved to Israel in 1972, who allegedly knew Stalin's mother and "told" about supposedly "creepy family life" of his "girlfriend"?! The authentic Coco is reliably evidenced by such a source as the "Spiritual Herald of Gru

Exarchate of Zin", where in the list of students of the Gori Theological School who moved from class to class "in the first category", from year to year the name of Dzhugashvili was the first. Yuri Vasilievich Emelyanov, the author of an excellent study on Stalin, rightly notes on this occasion that certificates of praise were issued only if there was an excellent mark in behavior, and this does not fit in the image of a gloomy obstinate, etc.

On the other hand, the portrait of a thin but strong boy with a stubborn *fearless* look of living dark eyes and with his head proudly thrown back, given by Iremashvili, obviously accurate.

The Georgian city of Gori is located at the confluence of the mountain rivers Kura, Big Liakhvi and Mejuda, 76 kilometers from Tiflis (Tbilisi). "Arrows" of rivers are always, as they say now, energetically favorable points on the globe. But the confluence of three mountain rivers is something special. Moreover, the rapid flow of icy water is not very conducive to learning to swim. Perhaps that is why, and also because Stalin had a hand injury as a child, he never learned to swim. But life on the banks of the Kura and the contemplation of the Kura could not but be imprinted deeply in his consciousness and subconscious.

Any large river is the fate of both the river itself and the people living on it. The one and a half thousand-kilometer Kura also has its own fate. Starting in the mountains of Turkey, it flows into the Russian mountainous Caucasus, flows through Gori, Tbilisi and then descends into the lowland zone of Azerbaijan, and there it feeds the swampy Shirvan, Mil, Mugan steppes, takes in the Araks in the lower reaches and does not break through near Bayramli directly to the Caspian



and falls sharply down to fall into it more than a hundred kilometers south of Baku.

Of course, Stalin, studying geography, learned about this early, and, having an inquisitive mind, he - as I understand it - more than once rushed his thoughts behind the Kury, and this current of thought led him far away.

Gori is also mountains. Actually, the title city and means in Georgian "hill, mountain" ...

And the mountains are also a special destiny, a special system of thought and feelings. Not without reason Stalin, speaking of Lenin after his death, time after time compared him to a mountain eagle. And this is clearly an image from

Stalin's childhood. Stalin himself was an eagle breed, and the fact that in his boyish perception it was the eagle that became the symbol of a bright life speaks of him as a person, in my opinion, much more than various "minania".

Today, it is not so easy to find out about Gori of those years when young Soko walked its streets, if, for example, you do not look into the 17th volume of the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron for 1893, where we can read .. But before

reporting what I read there, I would like to notify the reader of the following... Opening this volume, I was surprised to find that - at least in it - the letter "ÿ" is also missing. In the edition of 1893! And all sources attribute the time of its abolition to the post-revolutionary spelling reform of 1917-1918. Still, the story turns out to be dark with a sonorous Russian letter "ÿ"... For example, the modern "Russian" historian Gennady Kostyrchenko, the author of the monograph "Stalin's Secret Policy. Power and anti-Semitism", published in 2001 with the financial support of the Russian Jewish Congress, outlining the history of the restoration of the letter "Yo" in rights

Stalin, for some reason alludes to Stalin's "veiled personal anti-Semitism"...

Strange, Mr.

yes, sir, strange ...

Let us return, however, to the information about Gori the end century before last

"Burn... the county town] of Gori district , Tiflis province, is located at the confluence etc. - S. K.) pp. Liakhvy and Medzhudy in Kura, 72 miles from Tiflis, on the Transcaucasian railway, at an altitude of about 2000 feet [s] above the sea level, at the soles of the mountain crowned with the ruins of the ancient fortress of Goris

tsikhe, which, according to legend, was founded by the Byzantine emperors, during the war with Persia ... The time of the foundation of G[ori] in accuracy is unknown; anyway, cre the post existed before the city ... "

Brockhaus also reports that in the Georgian chronicle, according to some sources, si Gori is mentioned in the 7th century, and according to others - for the first time in the reign of Tamara. According to Armenian sources, the city was founded in 1123 by David the Restorer and inhabited by Armenians who sought refuge in Georgia. In the 16th century, the Turks took over the city and the fortress. In 1599, King Simon retook Gori back, and when King Rostom fell under the hand of the Persians, Shah Seif placed a Persian garrison in Goritsikhe. In 1710, under Vakhtang VI, the Turks were here again, and later, Shah Nadir, having taken Georgia from the Turks, destroyed Gori, and only in 1801, after the annexation of Georgia to Russia, Gori became a very prosperous picturesque county town.

a house with a Georgian-Armenian-Russian population of about 8

thousand. At the end of the 19th century, Maxim Gorky, traveling around Georgia,

looked into Gori. On November 26, 1896, the Nizhegorodsky Listok newspaper published his essay, which included the following lines: "The sultry sky over the city, the violent and muddy waves of the Kura near it, mountains nearby, in them there are some correctly located holes - this is not the cave city - and even further, on the horizon, eternally motionless white clouds - these are the mountains of the main ridge, showered with silver, never with snow." I

hope the reader will not be against me for such a detailed reference on the old Gori. Not only is it not without interest in itself, it also allows us to better understand the atmosphere in which Stalin grew up. He - with his creative, outstanding nature, did not need to read thick folios in order to be imbued with the spirit of History and its great events ...

The thought and soul of the boy soared in the heights, freely moving from one turbulent era to another, but the body had to live with the realities of the tsarist national outskirts. And they left Coco the only path to education: the same Gori theological school, in which he entered in the fall of 1888. By the way, among the educational institutions in Gori at the end of the 19th century, Brockhaus lists only the women's progymnasium and the Transcaucasian teacher's seminary with a Tatar department, keeping silent about the religious school. Stalin could not enter either

the first or the second of these institutions (the second - due to the lack of primary education), so for a nine-year-old Georgian from an impoverished Georgian

family had no choice. Theological school was a chance for the future. First of all, the mother understood this - her nature clearly affected the formation of her son's character, and had a beneficial effect. Yekaterina Geladze undoubtedly wished for her son a career as a priest, but it cannot be ruled out, however, that the impressionable and high-spirited boy crossed the threshold of the school to some extent consciously, seeking the spirit of

goddamn truths...

Does anyone have the right to grin at such an assumption? Coco Dzhugashvili was only nine years, and in the end, he didn't go to a merchant's shop, being unconditionally literate even before entering the school, but to the abode of the Higher – as it seemed to him then – Spirit ... The important thing is that from an early age he wanted to live a life filled with service to a lofty idea, and that is how he lived his life.

AS I SAID, I'm not writing a biography. And for this, I will only briefly report the following ... In the four-year Gori Theological School, Joseph Dzhugashvili studied for six years -

There was an attempt by the father to make a shoemaker out of his son, for which he temporarily took him with him to Tiflis.

And on September 2, 1894, Joseph entered the first class of the Tiflis Theological Seminary in order to study brilliantly there for almost five years and be expelled from it on May 29, 1899 for propagating the duo of Marxism. Kobe is twenty years old, but he is

already an almost fully formed professional revolutionary, and he is clearly of the Bolshevik persuasion, although at that time the concept of "Bolshevik" did not even exist.

Stalin himself, in the preface to the first volume of his Collected Works, wrote in January 1946 that his early period of activity (1901-1907) came at a time "when the development of the ideology and policy of Leninism was not yet completed ...". However, Stalin moved towards Leninism and Bolshevism to no small extent even apart from Lenin, on his own. To be convinced of this, it suffices to read the leading article published by Koba in September 1901 in the first issue of the newspaper Brdzola (Struggle) on behalf of the editors. The newspaper was published in Baku, and on November 11, 1901, Stalin, who had gone underground since March, was elected to the first Tiflis Committee of the RSDLP and at the end of November was sent to Batumi to organize a Social Democratic organization there.

On April 5, 1902, he was arrested for the first time, and he spent a year and a half, first in Batumi, then in Kutais, and then again in Batumi prison, from where he was deported on November 27, 1903 by stage to the first Siberian exile, to the village of Novaya Uda, Balagansky district, Irkutsk provinces.

On January 5, 1904, Stalin made his first escape in his life, in February he arrived in Tiflis, and the most active period of his illegal organizational activity in Transcaucasia began, which was interrupted only on March 25, 1908, when Stalin, under the name of Gaioz Nizharadze, was arrested in Baku and imprisoned. to Bailov prison.

By this time, he was already firmly included in the Leninist core of the party, at the First All-Russian Conference of the Bolsheviks in Finland, in Tammerfors, he met Lenin, in April 1906 he participated in the work of the Fourth "Unification" Congress in Stockholm, and a year later - in work of the Fifth London Congress. For the sword that later Stalin had to visit

abroad more than once, to live, for example, in Vienna, in Berlin, however, one often has to deal with the lies of malicious "biographers" about the fact that Stalin allegedly had never been abroad and did not know life abroad ...

Knew! And quite well. He

knew "Koba Ivanovich" (or - simply "Ivanovich") quite well and the royal prisons. And how he showed himself there, one can judge at least from the testimony of Semen Vereshchak, a former Socialist-Revolutionary, and in the twenties an emigrant. In Kerensky's Parisian newspaper Dni, in the issues of January 22 and 24, 1928, Vereshchak published two feuilletons about Stalin.

What could, it would seem, have been written about Stalin by his political enemy? And here's what...

"I was still very young when, in 1908, the Baku gendarme administration put me in the Baku Bayil prison. The prison, designed for 400 people, then contained more than 1,500 prisoners. One day a newcomer appeared in the Bolshevik

cell. And when I asked who this comrade was, they mysteriously told me: "This is Koba" (Stalin was then thirty years old. - S.K.).

Living in common cells, you inevitably get used to people and customs. The prison environment leaves its mark on people, especially on the young, who take their examples from the elders. The Baku prison had a huge influence on the newcomers. A rare young worker, having left this prison, did not become a revolutionary professional. It was a propaganda and militant revolutionary school. Among the leaders from

fights and circles, Koba also stood out as a Marxist. In a blue kosovorotka, with an open collar, always with a book ... "

Vereshchak had a revolutionary past, and, obviously, therefore, he did not have the moral strength to slander his own youth. Obviously, this is why his portrait of the young Stalin came out surprisingly impressive.

I continue quoting:

"Koba does not participate in personal disputes with nimal and always called everyone to the "organizational discussion." These "organized discussions" were permanent. Marxism was his element, in it he was invincible. There was no such force that would knock him out of his once occupied position. Such a person made a strong impression on the young party members. In general, in Transcaucasia, Koba was known as the second Lenin. Hence his very special hatred of the Mensheviks. In his opinion, anyone who calls himself a Marxist but interprets Marx in a way that is not Bolshevik is a scoundrel.

He always actively supported the instigators. This made him a good comrade in the eyes of the prison public. When in 1909, on the first day of Easter, the 1st company of the Salyan regiment passed through the ranks, beating the entire political corps, Koba walked without bending his head under the blows of butts, with a book in his hands ... "

Like this!

By the way, if you look at the detective card of I.V. Dzhugashvili from the archives of the tsarist secret police (photo from the side, full face, standing), where it is typed in small letters: "height 1 meter sant.", then you can make \_\_\_\_ out that before the typographic "sant." handwritten "74". Pretty average height. And how

many times I had to read and hear about the "dwarf" Stalin with a height of 155 and even less than centimeters! On November 9, 1908, Stalin was

expelled from Baku to the Vologda province under open police supervision for a period of two years. Then the tested scheme works: on June 24, 1909, he illegally leaves Solvychevodsk and soon finds himself again in Zakav

casier.

Since 1910, Koba has been an authorized representative of the Central Committee, an "agent of the Central Committee". However, on March 23 of this year, he was arrested under the name of Zakhar Grigoryan Melikyants, and after a six-month term in Bailov, he was again deported to Sol Vychegodsk .

From there, through Vologda, he illegally leaves for St. Petersburg, where on September 9, 1911, he was arrested and imprisoned in the St. imprisonment, followed by deportation to Vologda for a period of three years. And in

January 1912, Stalin, at the sixth "Prague" all-party conference, was elected in absentia a member of the Central Committee of the RSDLP (b) and in parallel - the head of the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee for practical leadership of revolutionary work in Russia. This even formally

made Stalin, perhaps, the second person in the party after Lenin. For personal information about the decisions of the Prague Conference, Ordzhonikidze came to Stalin in Vologda, and on February 29, 1912, Stalin once again



goes illegal. And again: Baku, Tiflis, Moscow, Petersburg... On April 22, 1912, the first issue of

Pravda came out with Stalin's article "Our Goals." Stalin wrote: "... we by no means intend to gloss over the differences that exist among the Social Democratic workers. Moreover, we think that a powerful and vital movement is unthinkable without disagreements—only in a cemetery is it possible to realize a "full identity".

in the eyes ... ".

Those who know the era of Stalin superficially reading these words, one may smirk — they say, in order to achieve "complete identity of views" in the USSR, the General Secretary later turned the whole country into a kind of cemetery. But only those who feed on myths about

Stalin and his deeds, without documentary information or maliciously ignoring it, can scoff in this way. In fact, Stalin was in the full sense of the word tolerant (that is, tolerant) towards other people's errors, but only sincerely, so to speak, sincere errors. The modern concept of "tolerance" comes from the Latin "tolerantia" - "patience". And Stalin - I am ready to repeat this over and over again - was extremely *patient* with Trotsky, Tomsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Bukharin and others like them ... Only repeatedly convinced of their further inability to loyal cooperation in the interests of the state, in their betrayal, double-mindedness and double-dealing, he went to eliminate them - not because of revenge, but because of historical necessity

distance.

Here's an example... On April 17, 1923, the XII Congress of the RCP(b) opened. When Leon Trotsky appeared in the hall

accompanied by Karl Radek, Klim Voroshilov shouted: "Here comes the Lion, and behind him his tail."

Radek then, in his immoderate printed praise of Trotsky, reached the point of outright servility—I ask the reader to take my word for it. So the ardent and sharp-tongued Voroshilov (in his youth he took the party nickname "Antimekov", which means "Against the "Meks", Mensheviks) was right, although he expressed his feelings in a rude way. And here is how Radek answered—in writing, which already ruled out rashness. He distributed

among the congress delegates there is the following, not witty, but spiteful quatrain: "Voroshilov

has a dull head. All thoughts  
are piled up. And it's better  
to be the tail of a lion, Than ...  
Stalin's.

Stalin then noticed that Radek did not have a tongue under repaired to him, and he to the tongue.

That was the end of the matter, and Radek-Sobelson has been in senior management for a long time, from in 1936 he was sent to a prison cell not for those old rhymes... In 1934, by the way, he wrote about Stalin: "Waves of love and trust came to the concise, calm as a cliff figure of our leader... ", etc. Let us return, however, to the day of April 22, 1912. On this day of the

publication of the first issue of Pravda, Steel is arrested and on July 2 is exiled to the Narym Territory for a period of three years.

And again he runs - almost immediately. Having reached the Neva capital, he was actively working throughout the autumn of 1912, and in November Lenin called him to Krakow - then Austro-Hungarian. Returning to St. Petersburg, Stalin soon - again at the call of Lenin -

travels to Krakow and Vienna, and upon returning to Russia, together with Sverdlov, reorganizes Pravda.

But on February 23, 1913, Koba was arrested once again and for the last time. On July 2,

1913, he was deported to the Turukhansk Territory, and in March 1914 he was transferred even further - beyond the Arctic Circle to the "machine" (village) of Kureika. It was only the

February Revolution in Petrograd that brought him back to Russia.

ONE OF THE CHAPTERS of Y. Emelyanov's dilogy about Stalin is called "Master of the Revolution"... Undoubtedly, a master. But not just a master of the revolution, but its acknowledged—already before the revolution—leader!

Moreover, with one significant addition: Stalin fought for the preparation of the revolution in Russia, always directly in Russia. This is his difference from all other recognized leaders, except for Yakov Sverdlov.

Only the latter had a pre-revolutionary biography of a professional revolutionary very similar to Stalin. Six years younger than Stalin, Sverdlov was arrested for the first time at the age of 16. And then, like with Stalin, until 1913 - an illegal position, revolutionary work, prisons, exiles, escapes, prisons, exiles, escapes, illegal work ... All the other leaders of the revolution were in Russia on visits - as they were Stalin abroad .

Trotsky, the same age as Stalin, fled from his first exile abroad in August 1902. Arrested in Russia during the first Russian

revolution and sentenced in 1906 to eternal settlement

in Siberia, he then fled and went abroad

finally.

Bukharin emigrated at the age of 23, Zinoviev (four years younger than Stalin) - finally in 1908, Rykov (two years younger than Stalin) - in 1910. Kamenev, being four years younger than Stalin and at one time being a member of the Caucasian Committee of the RSDLP together with Stalin, emigrated in 1908. True, in 1914 he was sent by Lenin to Russia to lead the Duma faction of the Bolsheviks. Kamenev was arrested in Petrograd, but he agreed to denounce the anti-war agitation of the Bolsheviks and was exiled to the Yenisei province. Released in February 1917, Kamenev arrived in Petrograd with Stalin on March 12 (25), 1917.

That is, Stalin knew not only abroad, but, above all, he knew Russia very well - from the Baltic to the Yenisei and from Vologda to the Transcaucasus. The

need for Lenin to be constantly abroad was obvious, but for the rest of the Bolshevik leaders ... Lenin was not only a theoretician

of the party, its

"brain", but also - if we continue the comparison with the human body - the "mediastinum" of the party. There was no way they could risk it! But after all, someone from the first persons of the Bolsheviks had to "pull" on the spot the daily "carriage" of internal Russian party work! So, he was more and more

"pulled" first of all by "Koba Ivanovich" Dzhugashvili ... And if we look at the role and significance of Stalin in the party before 1917, then they turn out to be unequivocally inferior only to Lenin. Only after the forced removal from the active struggle did Stalin fade into the shadows from the summer of 1913 until 1917 - like Sverdlov.

Moreover, this time it was not possible to change the situation by escaping and could not succeed for both. The fact is that it was simply impossible to successfully escape from that last link of theirs - the entire initial route was completely and effectively controlled by the police, since there was no other route due to the geographical features of the area. That is why even such aces of escape as Stalin and Sverdlov did not try to escape from the Turukhansk region, despite the need for their presence in the center of imminent events. But Lenin remembered Stalin... On July 23, 1915, he first asked

Zinoviev: "Don't you remember

the names of *Koba*?" Then, on November 9, he repeats this question to Karpinsky: "A big request: find out (from Stepko (N.D. Kiknadze. - *From K.*) or Mikha (M.G. Tskhakaya. - *From K.*), etc. ) surname "*Koba*" (*Joseph J?? we forgot*). It's very important!!"

.....

Before that, he informs the same V.A. Karpinsky: "Koba sent greetings and a message that he is healthy."

The fact that the name of Koby was forgotten in Switzerland speaks of one thing - the level of effective conspiracy in the Bolshevik Party. After all, Lenin did not live with Stalin for years and personally saw to them infrequently - mainly at large party meetings and congresses. And it can be assumed

that Lenin had serious views on Koba, counting on his escape from exile. But escape, as I said, was unrealistic.

It was only after the overthrow of the tsar that a telegram became possible, which went to Zurich to Lenin and Zinoviev from Perm: "Salut fraternal Ulianow, Zinowief. Aujourd'hui partons Petrograd..." ("Brotherly greetings to Ulyanov, Zinoviev. Today we leave for Petrograd") with signatures: Kamenev, Muranov, Stalin...

IN APRIL 1917, Lenin arrived in Petrograd. Stalin is already here. On the morning of April 4 (17), Lenin spoke in the Tauride Palace and proclaimed the slogan: "All power to the Soviets!" More than a half-year saga of preparation for October begins.

Stalin, introduced immediately after his return to Petrograd to the Bureau of the Central Committee of the RSDLP (b) and to the editorial office of Pravda, is elected to the Central Committee at the 7th (April) Party Conference and then enters the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and the Military Revolutionary Committee - the party Military Revolutionary committee for the preparation of an armed uprising. This uprising, which marked the beginning of the Great October Socialist Revolution,

became a reality on October 25 (November 7), 1917. From that day on, Stalin is one of the highest state leaders of the new Russia, which intends to become socialist not only in na society.

A certain Pshimaf Askorbievich Shevotsukov, in a publication recommended as a textbook for "Russian" history teachers (including university ones), writes:

"In a short biography of Stalin, published in 1950, it was said: "Stalin was the direct inspirer and organizer of the most important victories of the Red Army. He was the creator of the most important strategic plans. The most glorious victories of our Red Army are connected with the name of Stalin. For the modern reader, all this can only cause a smile ... ".

The statement about "smiling" is just as gloomy and vicious, how ignorant...

First, in 1950, the people themselves associated their most glorious victories with the name of Stalin. And secondly, already in the Civil War, the role of Stalin was exceptional. Apart from Trotsky, no one else has dabbled on all fronts like Stalin. But Trotsky was officially the chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic and a military commissar. Yes, and his stay at the fronts had the character of raids. And here, too, Stalin did a huge amount of daily rough work.

He became a member of the first Council of People's Commissars as People's Commissar for Nationalities, and since 1919 - also as People's Commissar for State control.

However, since May 1918 (that is, from the very beginning of the Civil War), Stalin has been in Moscow only on short visits - like Trotsky on short visits at the front. In a sense, the situation is repeated before 1917, when the leaders worked in exile, and Stalin - in Russia. Now the leaders are in the capitals, and Stalin is at the fronts. In May 1918, he

was appointed head of the food business in the South of Russia with dictatorial powers and on June 6 departed for Tsaritsyn with a special detachment of 400 people. He has two tasks: the procurement and export of grain from the North Caucasus to industrial centers and, as it soon became clear, the defense of Tsaritsyn from the troops of General Krasnov. The defense of Tsaritsyn is the key moment

of the first military summer in the Civil War. The "Reds" called it "Red Verdun", and the "Whites" - for example, General Wrangel, agreed with this definition. The battle of Verdun in the area of the city and fortress of Verdun in northeastern France was the key moment of the First World War.

us - the total losses of the parties amounted to about million people.

The surrender of Tsaritsyn in the Civil War would have been equivalent in military-political and military damage to the surrender of Stalingrad in the Great Patriotic War. That's what Tsaritsyn meant! Arriving there, Stalin

found in Tsaritsyn not a cheerful picture, and on July 19, 1918, the Military Council of the North Caucasian Military District was created, headed by Stalin. Voroshilov was soon appointed a member of the Military Council. The successful defense of Tsaritsyn is Stalin's first major success in the emerging Stalinist

epic.

The "extraordinary summer" of 1918 is over. In September, the Southern Front arose, and Stalin, a member of its Military Council, was fighting Trotsky, who wanted to saturate the leadership of the front with his proteges (because of this, we had a number of failures, and things improved only after Stalin appeared in the South as a member of the Military Council of the Southern front). And before that, Stalin will eliminate the

catastrophic failures on the Eastern Front. And after the South, Stalin is a member of the Central Committee commission to investigate the causes of the fall of Perm.

In the spring of 1919, with the mandate of the authorized Central Committee, he arrives in Zinoviev's Petrograd, where not the "leader" Zinoviev, but the "soldier of the Central Committee" Stalin organizes the defense of St. Petersburg from the advancing Yudenich.

In October 1919-January 1920, Stalin organized the defeat of Denikin, the last mortal threat to Soviet Russia. But Denikin was also a threat to Russia as such, because he, like all the other "white" "leaders", was only a protege of one or another external force. "White"



and they themselves did not hide the fact that the whole question is - who is of what "orientation" ... Kolchak, for example, was created by the Yankees, but he had to reckon with the Japanese, especially since they supported Ataman Semyonov, formally subordinate to Kolchak.

Denikin, on the other hand, was predominantly of Anglo-French "orientation." So, having defeated the "whites", the Russia of Lenin and Stalin accomplished the historically most important all-Russian deed - it preserved the country as a sovereign power. The slogan "One and a week of my Russia" was written on the "white" banners, and in life it was realized - in the hardest struggle against foreign invaders and internal traitors - "red" Russia. And the scale of Stalin's merits in that was, without exaggeration, historical.

It should also be noted that during the Civil War, in addition to solving the most important political problems, Stalin was engaged in what later - during the Great Patriotic War - was already done by him, Stalin's specially authorized representatives of the Headquarters of the Supreme High Command, including Zhukov and Vasilevsky . It is possible that

the very institution of representatives of the Headquarters of the Supreme High Command arose as a rethinking of Stalin's personal military experience during the C war.

Perhaps it is necessary to say a few words about the role of Stalin in the Soviet-Polish war of 1920 ... This war was inevitable insofar as: a) "remake" Poland wanted to stretch "from sea to sea", that is, the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea, and in 1919 it occupied part of the Ukrainian and Belarusian lands; b) Poland was incited and armed against Russia by the Entente, counting on the Poles as an anti-Soviet battering ram. France pre

gave Piysudski a loan of one billion francs, America an even more significant loan in the amount of about 160 million then dollars. However, having

begun, this war, in the view of Trotsky and the leftists, supporters of the immediate "world revolution", was supposed to bring this revolution on the ends of the sabers of the red horsemen through Poland to Europe. The commander of the Western Front, Tukhachevsky, was a creature of Trotsky, had exorbitant ambitions and conceit, but did not know how to think systematically. He rushed and rushed to Warsaw, or rather, sitting far from the front line, he drove and drove the increasingly tired Soviet troops to Warsaw. A member of the Military Council

of the Southwestern Front, Stalin always thought systematically. And therefore he understood well that the red cavalry would be successful only to the extent that they liberate their native lands from the Polish pans. They *liberated* Kiev "with a bang" ... But also *take* Warsaw? Stalin and Tukhachevsky in the

Polish war. Like, an envious and military ignoramus, Stalin thwarted the brilliant strategic plans of the clever Tukhachevsky, did not give the latter the First Cavalry on time, etc. Alas, few people understand to this day that Stalin supported the correct, realistic direction of the blow - to Lvov. Lvov is Ukraine, it is the equestrian part of the western edge of the Russian land. This is the support of the people.

And Tukhachevsky walked through purely Polish lands and already saw himself as Trotsky's warrior in the vastness of "revolutionary Europe". It is the warrior **Trotsky**

**whom**, because at the end of August 1920 Lenin signed the following resolution of the Politburo: "The Politburo decides to express the most severe condemnation of the act of comrades. Tukhachevsky and Smilga, who issued, without any right to do so, their own is worse than a tactless order that undermines the policy of the party and government. We are talking here about the order of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front No. 1847 of August 20, which stated that the Polish peace delegation consisted entirely of spies and counterintelligence officers and that peace could only be concluded "on the ruins of white Poland" .

This order contains the whole of Tukhachevsky: Trotskyite ambitions and arrogance, a penchant for an independent political role, ignoring directives, self-will.

Without dwelling on this story in more detail, I will simply say that the correctness of Stalin in his strategic assessment of the situation on the Polish front and the wrongness of the Central Committee, including his own wrongness, was later

recognized by Lenin himself. Stalin, after the Polish war, was sent by the authorized Politburo of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) to the Caucasus and played an outstanding role

in the return of Transcaucasia to Russia. After all, this was also an all-Russian cause, necessary at the same time for the peoples of the Caucasus itself. What is happening in Transcaucasia today is before everyone's eyes. But even ninety years ago, something similar happened there - a breakaway from Russia, active attempts to establish the influence of the United States, England, Germany, Turkey, with the behavior of the bourgeois political "top" openly treacherous in relation to the interests of Georgians, Armenians and Azerbaijanis: the Georgian Mensheviks, Armenian Dashnaks, Azerbaijani Mus

But Stalin preserved Transcaucasia for Russia... Without a doubt, he was only an outstanding organizer of the Caucasian masses in conditions when the process of sovietization of Transcaucasia was objectively inevitable. But do political leaders always keep pace with the historical process? Let's say that today it is objectively necessary to reunite Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Transnistria with Russia as soon as possible... But the mediocre Yeltsinoids point-blank do not see this objective reality and criminally miss the historical time and the historical chance - moreover, in a situation that is even more beneficial for Russia than ninety

years ago.

At such moments, it becomes clear who is who in Russian history and what is the place of certain historical figures and "figures" in it ... Returning to the twenties, we

see that in April 1922 Stalin at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the RCP (b ) was elected General Secretary of the Central Committee

Ahead were thirty years of struggle and labor, called during the life of Stalin the era of Stalin.

IF RUSSIA had not become Soviet, it would have turned out to be a semi-colony of the West immediately after the end of the First World War. This is the answer to the question: "What would happen if Russia became in 1918 not a Soviet, but a bourgeois parliamentary republic or a constitutional monarchy?"

And what would happen if, after the death of Lenin, it was not Stalin, but his main opponent Trotsky, who turned out to be the head of Soviet Russia? In 1918,

Trotsky and Stalin looked at the development of events in much the same way. Both of them: one - elegantly, in a lordly way, the other - simply, like a peasant, worked for the world socialist

republics. New Russia was assigned the role of an advanced detachment in it. The role is honorable, but not very staff.

However, with the successful development of events, Trotsky could not imagine himself otherwise than at the headquarters of world upheavals. He agreed only to the role of the party "gentleman" - as once Plekhanov. Trotsky was organically incapable of making sacrifices when it came to personal sacrifices. He willingly sacrificed others, both politically and physically... But himself... Neither he nor any of the

his entourage ...

Stalin was what was accurately called the "party soldier." He knew that every soldier carries a marshal's baton in his knapsack, but he also knew that a soldier should be ready to lay down his bones at any moment, before reaching the rank of corporal. And, even having already become a "marshal", Stalin retained in himself this eternal nature of a true soldier to sacrifice in the name of duty, up to the sacrifice of *his* life. The Civil War

ended, the USSR was formed in 1922. For Trotsky and the majority of the then Bolshevik elite, this meant only a "peaceful respite" before new world battles.

Stalin and his comrades-in-arms replaced the word "respite" in such a formula more and more often with the word "construction". With the obligatory addition - "socialist".

It was through this difference that at first the cracks of various "oppositions" and "deviations" began to lie, and then an **abyss** separating already two oppositely differing worldviews. One worldview is Stalin's,

realizing: "The Earth begins from the Soviet Kremlin." This attitude was formed as a new level of original Russian feeling - already free

from the original Petrine naivety, from the provincial Kireyevsky "Slavophilism" and from the Kadet, shining with a reflected European light volume, "Milyukovshchina".

The Russian monarch Alexander the Third spoke well: they say that Russia has only two reliable allies - "its army and navy." However, in deed, and not in words, he drove Russia into the Franco-Russian alliance, disastrous for her, already under his son, transformed into a triple Entente even more disastrous for Russia. The Russian monarch

Alexander the Third left a catchphrase to history: "When the Russian monarch fishes, Europe can wait"... But already under his son, Nicholas II the Bloody, Europe granted the Russian monarch the right to beat bison and deer without restraint in Belovezhskaya Pushcha. to shoot crows in Tsarskoye Selo, but kept him out of serious European and world politics.

Generalissimo Suvorov not only did everything right, but also spoke well. He said: "Where the deer passes, there the Russian soldier will pass. Where the deer will not pass, and there the Russian soldier will pass!" When the Austrian Hofkriegsrat (highest military council) decided to mint a medal in honor of Suvorov's crossing of the Alps, Suvorov, in response to the adjutant's joking question about how he imagines such a medal, replied that he would depict a Russian soldier on the obverse of the medal and wrote: "God is with us!", and on the reverse (reverse side of the medal) he would depict a gofkriegsrat and write: "God be with them ..."

Stalin also lived with these same feelings and thoughts, as a great patriot of Russia. And such thinking - even without knowing it - could be counted from the ideas of, for example, the outstanding Russian geopolitician Danilevsky. First edition

The first edition of his book *Russia and Europe* came out a year after the birth of Lenin, and two years before October, Vladimir Ilyich wrote in his phenomenally interesting *Notebooks on Imperialism* (in his notebook "ni") : "Danilevsky proved that Russia the defeat of France in the interests of the quarrel and enmity of France and Germany *for* the domination of Russia. An interesting thing is the story! It stretches a thin thread from Nikolai Yakovlevich Danilevsky to Lenin, who read him attentively, and from Lenin, with his understanding of the significance of Germany for Russia, to Stalin, already with his understanding of the significance of Germany for us, with his opposition to the attempts of Trotsky and Radek to quarrel the Russian and the German state from the beginning of the 1920s.

However, I digress... The point is not in the forerunners of Stalin's policy, but in the essence of the matter! For the first time in its history, the new, that is, Stalinist, Russia did not contemplate its own navel, like boyar Russia, did not look through the window cut by Peter at the enviable European life, did not peep through the keyhole of the Parisian brothels ... Russia for the

first time looked into the mirror and...began to put myself in order. Myself! And for yourself! Written,

but just washed off the dirt beauty, she glanced at people, then in the mirror to see there, again, **herself**.

This Russia became more and more aware **of its** beauty and believed in **its own** destiny and

star. This is what Stalin was great for already in the first years of his independent policy, this is what he earned for himself first place in the history of Russia - by developing in Russians a sense of national worth! Only in Stalin's Russia could a poet say: "The Soviets have their own pride, the bourgeoisie

we look down!" This is also why Stalin, after the death of this poet, said: "Mayakovsky was and remains the best poet of our proletarian era..."

The second worldview, which tried to establish itself in Russia after the end of the Civil War, was Trotskyist. Hostile to the first, Stalinist, it was saturated with disbelief in Russia's self-worth and in her personal creative path.

The most prominent representative of such thinking was not even Trotsky himself, but his closest associate, Christian Rakovsky, a revolutionary cosmopolitan throughout his biography (he was even born in Romania). The figure is now almost forgotten, and in the twenties - famous. Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, secret emissary in Europe and interlocutor of the founder of Weimar Germany Walter Rathenau in 1922, USSR ambassador to England in 1923-1924, ambassador to France in 1925-1927! The merits

of Rakovsky in the foreign policy development of the USSR can be without exaggeration defined as outstanding. But he was betrayed not by Russia as Russia, but by the USSR as a base for organizing a "world fire". On the morning of December 5, 1927, at the 15th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, he addressed the delegates gathered in the Kremlin with a speech that became his last public appearance as a major statesman. The presiding Rykov gave him the floor, but Rakovsky could not finish his speech. Under the storm raging in the hall and shouts: "Down with! Expel him from the party," he went into political oblivion. Why?



In 1927, Rakovsky, from the rostrum of the congress, clearly revealed both his position and the position of his opponent Stalin. Rakovsky - "the herald of the" irreconcilable", as he was called - accused Stalin of not only taking a course towards "consolidating and expanding a peaceful respite", but moreover, he believed in the possibility of "peaceful cohabitation of the USSR with the capitalist countries." Rakovsky, on the other hand, as

a convinced Trotskyist, believed that the victory of socialism would be ensured only by a "holy revolutionary war." That's the only way it's possible "open the vise that is strangling the first proletarian state" and transfer to the camp of socialism the large industrial countries of Western Europe, then their colonies and, ultimately, the whole world.

Rakovsky stated that a tragic (his own assessment!) situation had arisen: the USSR "has ceased to be an ideological danger to capitalism."

ical governments.

The fact that Stalin's USSR was preparing for the first five years did not encourage Rakovsky. On the contrary, in this (***specifically in this!***) he saw proof of the "counter-revolutionary nature of the Stalinist Central Committee."

And it turned out that with the Stalinist Soviet Union, which was turning from the proletarian base of the world revolution into socialist **Russia**, neither Rakovsky, nor Trotsky, nor tens and hundreds of thousands of their supporters were on the road!

Then not everyone in Russia fully realized this, with complete clarity. But the experienced World Capital immediately figured out the meaning of Trotsky's activities, and not by the irony of history, but by an accurate calculation, it is necessary to explain that at a time when Trotsky, being inside the Union, wanted to topple Stalin, the bourgeois newspapers seemed to support ... Stalin.

For example, the New York Times, before the 15th Congress, declared: "Do not destroy (politically. - S. K.) op

position (that is, the Trotskyists. - S.K.) meant to preserve the explosive that was planted under the capitalist world. It turned out that Stalin, in the person of

Trotsky, was destroying the "mine" planted under Capital. But if Stalin turned out to be almost an agent of capital, why was it necessary for The New York Times to declare this so loudly, exposing Stalin's "capitalist henchman" before the Russian Communists? Why was it necessary to strengthen the position in the USSR of Trotsky, who was so allegedly dangerous for Capital? Nevertheless, the largest newspaper Capital itself gave trump cards to Rakovsky, and he presented them from the rostrum of the congress! Strange? No! "No" because it was smart support for

Trotsky by  
the

West on the principle of "on the contrary." Capital already understood then that the Soviet bayonet is not so terrible as the Soviet hammer and sickle. The revolutionary "bayonet" is Trotsky. This is an external strife that is exhausting Russia with the whole world.

rum.

And behind Stalin - strengthening Russia "sickle and hammer".

Trotsky is a beautiful idea for **hundreds of thousands** enthusiastic idealists.

And Stalin - if he is firmly at the head of a powerful and rich country where Capital has no power, this is a convincing example for **billions** of ordinary people. Capital knew how to count. And

when Trotsky was expelled,  
bourgeois newspapers spoke sympathetically about Trotsky expelled from the USSR and slandered Stalin. Now *it would be more necessary*, because Stalin and Stalin's USSR acquired

in the eyes of all honest people a more and more attractive appearance.

But Stalin deserved it! After all, let us recall the testimony of Madame Tolstoy, he had an undeniable charm.

HERE is a LETTER from Stalin's daughter. I bring it from a photocopy placed in the book by Alexander Nikolaevich Kolesnik "Stalin's Chief Bodyguard", which does not consist of gossip, but of fragments of the court case of Stalin's former head of security, General Vlasik - a person who deserves a separate discussion, in this book, however, huts

accurate.

Stalin's handwriting, with a bright personality, is so legible that without any effort to read  
eat:

*"My hostess-Setanka - hello! I have received all  
your letters. Thanks for the letters! Didn't reply to emails because I  
was very busy. How do you spend your time, how is your English, do you  
feel good? I am healthy and cheerful as always. It's boring without you,  
but what can you do, I endure. I kiss you tightly.*

*Your secretary Papka-Stalin  
I kiss my hostess.*

*22/VII 39".*

So not just a loving father can write, but also an extremely non-selfish person. After all, he who, like a majordomo, carries a ceremonial cane in front of

his "greatness", would never write anything like that! The protruding belly will not allow!

But this was already written by a long-term head of a world power, one of the leaders of world politics - which at that time not everyone in the world recognized out loud, but could not but recognize in real political plans and calculations! It was written by "Comrade Stalin"! And this is written in a very kind, unhurried manner.

man. Capable of self-irony and ...

And, among other things, possessing virtually perfect mental and spiritual health. A vile action dates back to the time of the "catastrophe", the main character of which was the now deceased granddaughter of Academician Bekhterev, also Academician Natalya Bekhtereva. Then her statement was widely circulated that Stalin, according to her grandfather, was paranoid. And already in the "Russian" times, Bekhtereva innocently admitted that her grandfather did not say anything like that, but she was simply "asked"

so to speak...

The case for slandering Stalin is not an ordinary one. But it's typical. And here one involuntarily recalls the bitter words of Pierre Auguste Caron de Beaumarchais, who knew very well what the slanders of slanderers were: "First let us slander him, and only then

let us blame him for the bad reputation that we ourselves and created...

Typical examples of a social (in this case, it would be more accurate to say anti-social) order in a pure (or dirty?) form are the "biographies" of Stalin, written by authors such as the general "from ideology" Volkogonov, Edward Radzinsky, the Medvedev brothers and them similar. Let us take The Rise and Fall of Stalin by Fyodor Volkov—in the 1970s and 1980s, an ordinary "Soviet agitator

propovsky" historian. Despite the antagonism of surnames, Volkov and Volkogonov ended up in the same "flock" - falsification. So, back in 1989, Volkov, Doctor of Historical Sciences, together with another Doctor of Sciences, Arutyunov, reported that they were familiar with a document confirming Stalin's cooperation with the tsarist secret police, and the original, they say, is stored in the Central State Archive of the October Revolution in the fund Department of Police of the Yenisei Provincial Zhane

darma administration.

At the same time, doctors of science quote a deliberate fake - the so-called "letter of the gendarmerie colonel Eremin", put into circulation by the American Levin and worked out very porno, starting from the wrong form of the corner stamp and its spelling, continuing with text errors and ending with an obvious forgery of Eremin's signature, well known to archivists from **original** documents of the Police Department.

But what is significant! Volkov wants to stay within the framework of historical research, and not libel, and therefore his book lacks not only malice, but also facts and figures from the life of the USSR in the Stalin era. AND on thoughtful reading, the result turns out to be the opposite of the author's intention. Before us appears not the evil, but the great figure of Stalin in his laborious struggle for power and greatness. countries.

And, by the way, what are homegrown "analysts" to us when there is, say, a comparative biography of Stalin and Hitler, written by the famous English historian Sir Alan Bullock. His "Hitler and Stalin. Life and Power" is a well-known book, published and republished in different countries of the world.

naya.

Two volumes can hold a lot, and Sir Alan puts a lot in them. But what? It would seem that such a book, if it is a historian's work written for the general public, simply has to be not only popular, but also historical, that is, accurate in facts and accurate in concepts.

However, is it possible to take seriously a historian who refers to the numerical estimates of the repressed in the USSR, made by the physicist Sakharov? The greatest specialist in his field, the physicist Sakharov, understood history and politics a little better than paleontology.

But it is, little things. To understand the level of "historicity" and "thoroughness" of Sir Alan, it is enough to open at random almost any of the pages of his "Stalin-Hitler" epic and compare the statements zheniya, there available, with historical data. For example, Bullock can write as follows: "Although slave (?! - S.K.) labor in the camps was not very productive, it nevertheless formed part of the Soviet economy: millions worked in mines, a million and a half at construction sites, laid railroad tracks". This is not written by a science fiction

writer or a tabloid writer. This is written by a historian, who may not give figures, but is obliged to know them, and not knowing, has no right to use some kind of digital data

rip.

So, according to Bullock, millions of "slave miners" worked in the mines alone in the Stalinist USSR. Well, let's check the numbers... In

1913, there were 643,745 mining and mining workers in Russia. This is all - not only in the mines. 194 thousand people worked at the mines. The number of mining machines did not then reach 100 (one hundred), and the share of mechanized mining

coal did not reach even two percent (1.7 %). Almost 29,117 thousand tons of coal were mined by hand.

By the time Bullock describes, coal production in the USSR had risen to 64 million tons in 1932 and 128 million tons in 1937. At the same time, there were only 1278 heavy cutters in the USSR alone. There were almost seven thousand jackhammers! And mechanized coal mining reached 89.6 percent by 1937 (in Germany then - 84.7%, in the USA - 77%, in Sir Alan's England - 51%). True, they rolled up to domestic coal even more than half by hand.

Compared with 1913, the number of miners in the country increased by 1935 to 425 thousand people... Quite a few, however, "millions" of "slaves", "scanned" somewhere by Bullock, did not smell in the mines. In addition, the coal industry of the USSR at that time was almost the most advanced in the world, and it could not be otherwise! It's not a joke to double the number of workers and more than quadruple production. This can be ensured not by "slaves", but by the latest mechanization of production, which happened in the USSR, and by highly qualified workers. Alas, "objectivity"

in Bullock's quotation marks is typical of all anti-Stalinist "research". Thus, the already homegrown slanderers, the Medvedev brothers (one of whom, Zhores, has long, indeed, been supplemented with British oatmeal), in the book Unknown Stalin, without hesitation, asserted that "the main role in the speed of a practical solution" of all the tasks of the Soviet Atomic Project "in the form of reactors, factories, test sites and the entire infrastructure, the gulag played unconditionally (that's right, in lower case letters. - S. K ..), a *unique* gigantic reserve of highly mobile and, in essence, slavish, but qualified fighting strength "...

In the system of the Glavgorstroy of the USSR, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, responsible for the construction - nothing more - work in the Atomic Project, actually worked in some periods up to a hundred or more thousand prisoners, who were, by the way, in quite satisfactory - for prisoners -

conditions. But, firstly, the prisoners worked at large construction sites in the 60s and 70s, which is generally quite understandable. At the same time, all construction projects could have been successfully

completed without them. Secondly, there is no need to talk about any intellectual participation of prisoners in the creation of reactors, factories, test sites and other infrastructure of the nuclear industry (the participation of German specialists in nuclear work is a separate article, besides, they lived and worked without being private, in places, although isolated, but resort in the exact sense of the word).

Thirdly, for information refuting the "Gulag" insinuations of the Medvedevs, I do not even refer the reader to my book "Beria: The Best Manager of the 20th Century", but to the official multi-volume publication of documents "Soviet Atomic Project", edited by L.D. Ryabev, on which two such experienced veterans of the nuclear industry as G.A. Goncharov and P.P. Maksimenko. There, by the way, there is curious data about those "arts" that were created at the "objects" by the "victims of Stalinism" released at the end of their term ... Because of them, scientific and engineering workers and members of their families at one time in the evening nose to the street afraid to come out.

THIS WAS THE MATTERS WITH Bullock's "millions of slaves" in the mines of the Soviet Union and other "slaves", including "atomic" ones... And how was it in the USSR



Stalin in general with "slave labor" as a social and moral category?

I address the topic of repressions of the thirties for the first time in this book, but I will return to it more than once, because today the "Great Terror" is perhaps the last major anti-Stalinist "trump card" of the "democrats" ... And since it, although in order and for the salty, so far "plays" a significant role in the mass anti-Russian "games", this trump card must be beaten and beaten over and over again ...

First of all, it must be said that the repressions and the Gulag system in the USSR of the thirties is a complex phenomenon, and a real (that is, an honest) historian should approach it with particular care.

For example, today "advanced" journalists willingly illustrate their articles about the "Great Terror" with a photograph, where in the foreground a shabby guy in a padded jacket and earflaps is holding a large chisel placed on a boulder, and the second a guy in a padded jacket is preparing to hit him with a sledge hammer. And this is against the backdrop of stone slopes, groups of other prisoners busy with everything, Chekists in shi nelyah and leather jackets ...

The beginning of what the "democrats" call the "Great Terror" and which I will say more about in due time, refers to August 1937, and the favorite photo of the "democrats" was taken no later than 1933, because it captured an episode of the construction of the famous Belomorkanal, which came into operation in 1934. But this is not even the main thing ... It is

remarkable that the photo was taken from the actual official book on the history of the construction of the White Sea-Baltic Canal named after Stalin, written by a team of Soviet writers at the suggestion of Gorky, who edited it.

This book strikes with its psychological credibility not because of the super talent of its professional authors, among whom were E. Gabrilovich, M. Zoshchenko, V. Inber, V. Kataev, V. Shklovsky, but because of the confessions of a number of "Canal Army men" from among the former Vremen lay engineers, who also worked as engineers on the White Sea Canal, as well as from among the former corners

nicknames.

The book described, for example, the life of a former businessman-engineer, former chief of defense of the Winter Palace, Colonel Ananyev ... And a portrait of engineer K.A. was also placed there. Verzhbitsky with the caption: "Former pest, and then one of the authors of the Belomorstroy project. Awarded the Order of Lenin.

These were destinies, really *reforged* by labor and the era of Stalin. And it was amazing then, and even more amazing today! To show the

ambiguity of that era, I will dwell on only one of its tragic destinies ... Georgy Ivanovich Porshnev, in his time a

very famous bibliologist... He worked and traveled to Germany. And in the early 30s he became a prisoner just at Belomorkanalstroy. His letters to his daughter, published in 1990, show how difficult things were back then.

one hundred...

Here is a letter dated April 3, 1932: *"There are no aspirations ... I have forgotten how to think, my consciousness is not illuminated by a dream ... I still believe in the progressive course of the historical process, I admire social construction and participated in it to the best of my ability and understanding , but I am crushed by the shame that has befallen me and the complete disregard for the personality, which Loveka "...*

It would seem that here it is, the verdict on "slave labor" through the lips of the "slave" himself. But the tone of the letter of May 1 is already different: *"The world is good! May is a holiday no worse than Easter. Its nature is even more affectionate, and its meaning is immeasurably greater. Today, even the grimaces of history and the vicissitudes of fate do not bother me. I listen to the surf of public excitement in Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov (the "slaves" of Belomorstroy had not only radios, but also their own newspapers and magazines. - S.K.), I envy those walking in columns and contemplating them, and I rejoice. Yes, the world is good, daughter! It is still too early to die, all the more so since in our trouble* which is not "...

And the letter of July 4 generally depicts a very strange way of life for a "Stalinist slave": *"Again, my dear, I rummage through book dust, bathe in the legendary Onego and wander through the Bear Mountains. The year is beautiful, the lake is just as charming (and the beaches, as in Evpatoria). A year has passed. And the* "slave" letters

take on an unbelievable appearance in general: "You are completely freed from book service, dear. Very full. In line are Rolland, Goethe, Blok, Tynyanov ("The Wax Person"). The hand reaches out to the magazines (Kr. Nov, Nov. Mir, Zvezda, Oktyabr, etc.), to the Reform (The technical edition of the book), Kugel, Boborykin ... I am waiting and looking for Bely "Masks". "Poetry and Truth" by Goethe disappointed..." How is this to be understood? Why are the "slaves" (and we are talking about a

working library for prisoners and civilians) Tynyanov? Well, a "slave" would write about what disappointed him

gruel - everything would be in place. And Goethe?

Well, if he was looking for an extra black cracker, then no - give him White! Yes, not bread, but a poet ...

Three days later, a new message - about a certain "discovery". What could please the "slave" this time - a hole in the barbed wire or in the wall of the food pantry? No: "*Kalevala*" opened! .. "

Y-yes ...

In the "slave" concept is all squeezed hardly. Although the tragedy does not cancel. But as for our pains, Sir Alan Bullock. It is more convenient for him to be content with fakes like Solzhenitsyn's. Already they are in his "historical" concept

tion fit perfectly.

As well as numerous fakes and slander about Stalinist collectivization of agriculture.

The ESSENCE of the REAL Stalin, better than in any of his deeds during his lifetime, came to light in the first days after his death: **the country was crying**. What do all the opuses of the Volkogonovs with the Volkovs and Radzinskys mean in comparison with this? When Brezhnev died, the country grinned. She did not notice Yeltsin's death. Gorbachev's death will certainly be delighted. And she sobbed for Stalin. Incidentally, on March 5, 1953, the greatest theologian of the twentieth century, Karl Barth, said that he had been praying for Stalin for years, small, but wishing him well.

But even in that year, 1953, more than half of the population of Russia lived in the countryside. By the time of the year of the "great turning point", by 1930, Russia was more than three-quarters rural. Would Russia have wept for Stalin if the collectivization of

agriculture had not been an urgent necessity, which Stalin realized earlier than others, but, by the way, not the first. However, first things first...

In 1929, the first five-year plan began in the USSR. Its success or failure determined everything - both the position of Russia in the world and the fate of Russia. On November 19, 1928,

Stalin spoke in captivity to the Central Committee:

"... The question of the rapid rate of development of industry would not be as acute with us as it is now, if we had the same developed industry and the same developed technology as, say, in Germany, if The share of industry in everything in the national economy was as high in our country as, for example, in Germany. The fact of the matter is that in this respect we are behind Germany and we have not yet caught up with her in those respects.

no-economic relation.

The question of the rapid rate of development of the industry would not be so acute if we represented not the only country wild tattoos of the proletariat, and one of the countries of the proletarian dictatorship. Under this condition, the question of the economic independence of our country would naturally recede into the background, we could join the system of more developed proletarian states, we could receive from them machines for the impregnation of our industry and agriculture, supplying their raw materials and food products. But you know that we do not have this condition. That's why it's a matter of catching up

and overtake the economically advanced countries, Lenin posed as a matter of life and death  
ti of our development ... "

So, the issue of industrialization for Russia was a matter of life and death. But in order to work, a worker needs to eat. And the then village did not give bread to the city - even for a half-starved ration ... January 15, 1928 letter train

from Steel

nym went to Siberia for three weeks.

Novosibirsk, Barnaul, Rubtsovsk, Omsk...

Conversations revealed a gloomy situation: the agricultural problem was reaching a dead end. In 1926/27, the USSR exported 2 million 178 thousand tons of grain, and a year later - only 344 thousand, and 248 thousand even had to be imported. The reason was not harvests, but in the fact that the village did not want to give grain "cheaply". The kulaks sabotaged grain deliveries and waited for market prices **to triple** (!).

What was the Soviet government supposed to feed those who were supposed to lay the foundation for the new industrial power of Russia in factories and factories?

What was she supposed to feed those who should was to build thousands of new plants and factories?

Fifteen years ago, the average inhabitant of the Russian Empire had **one teaspoon** of sugar per day. The average peasant did not see sugar, in fact, at all. In a report to the Fifth Congress of Authorized United Noble Societies in 1909, its author V. Gurko wrote:

"The export of bread does not come from prosperity, and from need, comes at the expense of feeding the population. Our people, as you know, are a forced vegetarian, that is, meat is almost never sees."

Soviet power gave the peasant land and **satiety** - in the second half of the twenties, with restoration of pre-revolutionary production

grain, it was exported four to five times less than before! As a legacy from the

centuries of tsarism, the horizons of the village remained no further than a sparrow's nose. Zakan

the first third of the twentieth century was in full swing, and the psychology of the middle peasant was not far removed from the eighteenth century. In the situation of those years, such a gap threatened not with backwardness, but with the death of the country. Russia could neither develop nor defend itself. Besides, could the

village of that time feed Russia, even if it wanted to? Under the "democratic" candidate for the right

to personify the entire history of Russia in the 21st century, Tsar Nikolai, a lot of bread was exported due to the hungry belly of the peasant, and not due to the large-scale commercial production of grain, which, as we see, even the nobles were worried about. their congresses. When the First World War broke out, this weakness of Russian agriculture showed itself very quickly. And not the Bolsheviks, but the tsarist government on November 29, 1916, for the first time introduced the concept of "compulsory surplus appropriation", issuing a decree "On the apportionment of grain bread and fodder." Professor Kondratiev quite clearly showed all this in his book *The Market for Grains and Its Regulation during War and Revolution*. In 1922, it was published in

an edition of two thousand copies, and one of them was in Lenin's personal Kremlin library. The second edition - 1991 - also cannot be called mass-produced: four thousand copies.

It was immediately clear from Kondratiev's data that the tsar's grain exports were based on the malnutrition of the peasant, without any benefit to the latter, but with great benefit to the former. There would have been no patches for Ivan's doom, and the mistress of the tsar and the grand dukes, ba

Lerin "Malechka" Kshesinskaya, would have neither a palace nor diamond sets. Now, at the end of the 1920s, it was

even necessary to go to the extreme, to make a "break", to pay for patches, so that in return the peasant would have a tractor and his own, Russian, chintz. But the main thing is that Russia should have its own ***planes and tanks in the quantities necessary for defense!*** But for this it was necessary to feed millions

new workers of Russia...

Did the village understand the need for this? No. What was

left? Only what he offered ... And who offered what?

The reader will probably

answer: "Of course, Stalin! It was he who proposed to immediately socialize the peasant farms!" However, answering this way, the reader will be mistaken!

And here I must report that the forced collectivization

of Russian agriculture was proposed not by Stalin and not a party member at all, but by a non-party, an outstanding Russian economist Vasily Sergeevich Nemchinov. Born in 1894 (died in 1964), he was a representative of the same Russian school of economics from which Vasily Leontiev,

one of the world's leading economists, emerged and which took shape in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A specialist in the field of agricultural economics and agrarian relations, by the mid-1950s the author of more than 40 scientific papers, among which was the textbook "Agricultural Statistics with the Fundamentals of General Theory" awarded the Stalin Prize in 1946, and a holder of two orders of Lenin, Nemchinov was not a politician, but a scientist, and at the end of the 20s he was a member of



Nemchinov wrote a historical, without exaggeration, memorandum, in fact, a study in which there were not declarations, but figures. And they showed that before 1917, more than 70 % of marketable (that is, for sale) grain was produced by large capitalist-type farms, employing four and a half million wage-workers in 1913!

That by 1928 the agriculture of the USSR was dominated by the middle peasant, unable to provide the country with bread with all their desire... That the village of the late 1920s, although it provided the total production of bread 40% more than the prerevolutionary peasantry as a whole, almost everything was consumed by itself, sending only 11.2% of the produced grain for sale! For Stalin, acquaintance with the study of Nemchinov meant, without exaggeration,

a radical change in consciousness! As early as February 13, 1928, immediately after the Siberian trip, Stalin sent an appeal to all organizations of the CPSU(b) under the title "First results of the procurement campaign and further tasks of the party." And there he explained the failures in procurement, firstly, by the mistakes of the central and local authorities, and, secondly, by the fact that the peasants were not provided with the required amount of industrial goods in exchange for grain, or rather, in exchange for the money paid to them. for grain deliveries. And suddenly Nemchinov strictly scientifically, with numbers in his hands, proved that even if the village

were flooded with gramophones, ball gowns and sundresses, boots and barrels with "karasin", then all the same, the then village with its production structure could not give the country what it needed for food development!

Agriculture, even in Soviet Russia at the end of the 1920s, was too backward. And for this we had to “thank” first of all the “democratic” candidate for the right to personify the entire history of Russia in the 21st century — Tsar Nicholas II... As well as his father, Tsar Alexander III, and also Nicholas’s grandfather, Tsar Alexander II, as well as the great-grandfather of Tsar Nicholas II - Tsar Nicholas I ... It was they, instead of giving the cause of state

administration and development of the state entrusted to them - as Stalin did - all their strength and all their time, to amuse their pride, they arranged reviews, appeased the elite, threw balls, built mansions for mistresses, condoned state thieves ... And they dealt with Russia in this way - in between times. And even when they did it, they did it to the point of criminal mediocrity! What was Stalin to do after he got acquainted with Nemchinov's report? As early

as February 13, Stalin declared:

“Talking that we are supposedly abolishing the New Economic Policy, introducing a surplus appraisal, dispossession of kulaks, etc., is counterrevolutionary chatter, against which a decisive struggle is necessary...”.

Now he learned from Nemchinov's note that in the harvest year of 1926 the village produced 65.5 million per ton of grain - 25 million tons more than in a good year before the revolution, and only 7.4 million tons were sold. Actually, Stalin knew the figure itself even before that, but only an intelligent and well-versed professional could give the overall picture and its analysis. The outstanding professional Nemchi has given a general analysis of the problem.

The solution to the problem was to be given by the politician, the head of state. That is Stalin. A year later, the first five-year plan began with its inevitable increase in the urban population ... And even without this, by the end of 1928, bread carts had to be introduced in the cities

points.

What was left for Stalin, and in general for any statesman responsible for the past and future of Russia?

Refuse forced industrialization? This meant, most likely, the unpunished occupation of Russia in the next five decades.

ten years.

Should we restore those farms that until 1917 produced almost all marketable grain? This meant in fact, a return to capitalism, that is, a return to the situation when someone ate oysters in Paris, and someone did not even have a teaspoon of sugar on the table. Russia, having gone through three revolutions and two wars, could no longer afford this and would not have allowed it to Stalin. Yes, and he himself would not

have gone for it - was he spitting blood for *this* in a forty-degree frost in the Turukhansk region? So what was left for Stalin and

Russia? And what Stalin and the people of Ivan da Marya did: overcoming the resistance of Vanek and Manek at all levels, they created in the shortest possible time such agriculture that could feed

both village and city...

AND STALIN is collectivization. And the Volkogonovs and Radzinskys of that time were its deliberate "excesses". Although there were enough excesses and unintentional ones, because the most "guilty" in the ex

The processes of collectivization, or rather, without guilt, turned out to be the eternal darkness of the peasant masses - both those who approved collectivization and actively participated in it, and those who initially did not accept it and opposed it.

Let's say that in 1929 - in the year, according to Stalin's precise expression, the "great turning point" - there were (by the way, all the information is taken from the mass reference calendar for 1941) in the country almost thirty-five million horses. And in 1932 - only twenty million. Sheep with goats decreased by two thirds in two years, pigs - by half, cows - by a third. The peasants themselves cut them out!

But it was not Stalin who slaughtered them, but a peasant, confused by the kulak propaganda of the then Volkogonovs, the small-town arrogance of the then Radzinsky and sob in a sparse way: "I won't eat it, I'll bite it."

Think, reader! Tens of millions of cattle slaughtered overnight, that is, in fact, heads of cattle were killed! This is the price of the stubborn "individuality" of the middle peasant and the class resistance of the kulak. And this is -

one of the reasons for the poor people's table in the thirties, one of the reasons for the famine of 1933 ... And here are some more

numbers. Private, relating

only to one locality, but eloquent. For several years, a gang of 35 people operated in the village

of Noviki, Ryazan district. 38 thefts, 28 arson, 13 murders, 11 beatings, 3 armed raids. "In addition," Vechernyaya Moskva wrote on November 17, 1928, "bandits pursued and beat Komsomol members, driving the cell underground. Zapu

the gangly population was silent.

The inability of the people to think, their inability to correctly assess the situation and see the future -

terrible things, terrible first of all for oneself  
people.

For example, in 1991 this inability led to the implementation of the most evil plans of the enemies of Russia and gave rise to those disastrous processes that are developing within the borders of the USSR and beyond them to this day. Moreover, the "moment of truth", terrible for the peoples of the USSR, is yet to come — when professionals begin to die out, when social ties that are already disintegrating today begin to rapidly disintegrate, when hydrocarbon energy (on oil) will be replaced by hydrogen energy (on hydrogen) and the exaggerated "oil » "well-being" of "Russians" in a matter of years will burst...

And so it will be, if the peoples of the USSR do not come to their senses at least on the

edge of the abyss. For the then peasants, the "moment of truth" - but a beneficent one - was also ahead, and then they would say: "Before the war, we began to live ..."

But in real time, there was everything ... Historian

Vadim Valerianovich Kozhinov in his assessments, As for my taste, it is far from always accurate. However, his books contain many interesting facts. They also include data that V.V. Kozhinov cites with reference to an extremely small-circulation book by the modern Tyumen writer K.Ya. Lagunov about the Tobolsk peasant uprising of 1921.

Next, I quote Lagunov's book on the book V.V. Kozhinov "The truth of Stalin's repressions":

"Wild fury, unprecedented atrocities and gestures that was what distinguished the peasant uprising of 1921... Communists are not shot, but sawn up with saws or doused with cold water and frozen. And they also smashed skulls with clubs; burned alive;

they ripped open their bellies, stuffing grain and chaff into the abdominal cavity; dragged after a galloping horse; pierced with stakes, pitchforks, red-hot peaks; they smashed the genitals with hammers; drowned in holes and wells. It is difficult to imagine and describe all those inhuman torments and tortures through which Communists and all those who at least somehow showed a benevolent attitude towards Soviet power went to death ... "

Here it is - the people of Manek and Vanek in their logically, psychologically and historically completed form. Even reading this is not easy... But knowing this is essential for a correct assessment of the significance of Lenin and Stalin for Russia, for understanding what they were leading

Russia away *from* . And how did it all end? Well, Lagunov - it to give him his due, despite his obvious, albeit sluggish anti-communism, he does not hide this. Although he is laconical, he reports that the Siberians quickly became fascinated "in the power created during the uprising" and "not only hurried to leave the insurgent regiments, but also helped the Red Army quickly put out the flames of the uprising ... The people ignited the uprising, the people extinguished

it ...". Lagunov, like himself, perhaps, Kozhinov, is sluggish anti-communist, which is quite typical for Russian intellectuals. And he, it seems, sincerely does not understand that it was the people, together with the Soviet government, who *extinguished the* brutal, senseless Russian revolt against the Soviet regime ...

But it was by no means the people *who "fired"* him. Lagunov himself describes one of the true arsonists (more precisely, of course, an agent of the true arsonists), the village priest Bulatnikov. This

The "servant of God" sentenced people to painful executions even when the "rebels" themselves were indulgent towards them... Lagunov reports:

"Teachers sentenced by Bulatnikov, huts, communists were killed with a special hammer with soldered teeth and pitchforks with serrated ends ...".

But this is not only a real historical detail from our history, dear reader!

This is also a "significant" detail, a generalized essence of the confrontation of that time!

On the one hand, Lenin and Stalin, the Soviet government and the communists, who came to power in Russia in order to rally and enlighten its people, and, therefore, to make them truly free. And on them On the other hand, there are teachers

and enlighteners... On the other hand, there are greedy proprietors who want to preserve the old, dark, ignorant, disunited Russia at any cost and do not stop at any, the most brutal methods for this. And on their side - gloom

sy and fanatics.

Is it any wonder that today's "Russian" churchmen are calling for a new crusade against communism? After all, the sight the people are always mortally dangerous for the regime of the oligarchs, who generously "unfasten" unjust "donations" to the "fathers".

Something similar to what they did provocation and ignorance in the early twenties and what K. Lagunov described, will be repeated in the period of the collectivization at the turn of the twenties and thirties years.

And I'll tell you about it now.

Alas, not only in 1921, and not only in Tobolsk, there was enough cruel and greedy kulak desire to maintain their informal power and cruel peasant ignorance. It was February 1930. In the Pitelinsky district of

the Ryazan district of the Moscow region, collectivization began. The chairman of the district executive committee, matrotskyist Strodach, appointed three incompetent but zealous "chiefs" Fedyaev, Subbotin and Olkin at the head of the district, and they began to "collectivize" the district without any preliminary preparation. But before such a turn of affairs in advance

well prepared the other side. In the villages of

the region there appeared "wanderers" and "soothsayers" who told wild things about the collective farms, frightening them with the socialization of wives and children on Stalin's orders. The uprising is ripe, and the headquarters "five" was ready a long time ago: a socialist-revolutionary, a fist, a priest from the village of Veryaev, a former white officer and a former criminal

"Alena the Bogatyr". March 2 from seven villages and four villages a crowd of about three thousand people, mostly women. The kulaks knew what they were doing... The connoisseur of the Russian countryside, the Narodnik Alexander Nikolaevich Engelhardt, about whom the reader will learn more later, subtly remarked in his time: "Women have much more initiative than peasants. Women are somehow petty greedy, without any consideration for the future. This is always in the hands of the kulaks, and they always strive to bridle the women, and once this is done, the village is in the hands of the village kulak, who then already turns everyone around . This was

said about the village of the 70s of the XIX century, but it was true for the village of the XX century.

From the village of Veryaev we went to Pitelino. They walked with axes, pitchforks and berdanks, with icons and banners



mi, singing "God Save the Tsar", under the alarm ring  
stakes

The crowd grew, and the intoxicated Alyona led it with two  
revolvers in his pockets and grenades in his belt. A  
contemporary of this turmoil writes:

"Policeman Goryunov and an agronomist came  
out to meet the crowd, distraught with anger, from  
Pitelin to persuade them to go home, but before they  
could open their mouths, shouts were heard from all  
sides: "Beat them! Do loi!... Push!... Push!" And after  
that, there were heard the deaf thuds of stakes, the  
cracking of skulls, and the policeman and the agronomist  
were gone. They were killed by the rebels, who,  
moving on, continued to sweep away everything they  
hated in their path.

The district center of Pitelino was surrounded ...

From the side of Sasovo, a detachment of three hundred  
Red Army men approached, in front of which were the  
commander and Strodach

with a revolver. - Oh, you came to frighten us and drive us  
to the collective farms? Will not go! Down with the collective  
farms, the crowd roared, approaching Strodach in order to tear him apart

Strong Alyona turned her back to Strodach, the eyes of the  
Red Army soldiers opened up a huge naked backside, and its  
owner yelled under the cheers of the CROWD: - Here's a  
collective farm

for you! Look! Strodach fired,

Alena fell. New roar: - Bay! Death to the  
communists!

And the detachment commander

orders the first salvo to be fired over the heads, but only  
after the third, still overhead, the crowd began to scatter ...

However, on the same day, three collective farm chairman, communists, Komsomol members and some collective farmers.

From May 5 to May 11, 1930, there was a trial in Pitelin. Subbotin, chairman of the district executive committee, his deputy Olkin, judge Rodin, head of the district administrative department Yurkov, district commissioner for collectivization Kosyrev, secretary of the district committee of the party Vasilchenko, and not yet

how many people.

Strodach was also removed.

And the people of Pitelin, as once the people of Tobolsk, remember foxes.

But none of them ever found out that the newspapers of London, Paris, New York were already writing about the "heroic knights of the fight against communism near Moscow" ... Such was the

"spontaneous" popular will  
knowledge.

A lot of noise in the West was made then by the history of an outwardly completely different kind. Almost a thousand Swedish colonists from the village of Staroshvedskoe, Kherson District, Ukrainian SSR, decided to return to Sweden under the influence of anti-Soviet propaganda.

The Swedes left, but Western newspapers no longer wrote that in their "historical homeland" the settlers immediately had difficulties with land and work. I had to be hired as farm laborers. And the Kherson Swedes pulled back. Necessary

to pay tribute to the Swedish government - it did not interfere with them, just like the Soviet government. In 1931-1932 the majority returned. Collectivization took place in different ways.

Authorized to organize a collective farm, military co

Missar of the Pavlograd district in the same Ukraine, a former Chapaev Sidor Kovpak, before calling a meeting of the villagers, lived in the village for two weeks and walked by huts.

And even here, no Alena with bulges of any size and in any place could have knocked people off the collective farm path. Stalin knew about

all this. Accurate Information

about the situation in the countryside lay down on his desk in the form of reports from the OGPU. And Stalin's answer was at first secret directives and telegrams recommending that the pace of collectivization be slowed down. But the exasperation of the Shtrodachs, the impatience of Sholokhov's foragers, the incitement of the kulaks, and the dark frenzy of the peasantry have already intertwined into one prickly tangle. Telegrams did not help.

And then Stalin's article "Dizziness from Success" appeared. The rearing country began to come to its senses. And much later, the Yelets peasant Dimitry Egorovich Morgachev admitted in his article to a peasant newspaper: "Yes, dear reader, it is difficult and very difficult for a natural peasant to give up personal property."

On the other hand, it is easy to give up personal responsibility to a "natural intellectual". For example, the philosopher Mikhailov and the economist Teptsov, sixty years after the "turning point" of 1929, in the "perestroika" year of 1989, declared that supposedly, even in 1940, collective farm fields produced only 88 percent of grain, although they occupied 99.1 percent of the sown area. . It turned out that the yield on a personal plot was 13 times higher than on a collective farm? Of course, this is stupid and vicious nonsense. It was true,

however, that at the end of the thirties the personal herd of collective farmers exceeded

collective farm, but it grew much faster than in the pre-kolkhoz years. The number of pigs increased by nine million from 1923 to 1929, and by fifteen million from 1932 to 1938. But even this is not at the behest of a pike ... The Plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union

Communist Party of Bolsheviks in June 1934 decided "to eliminate the lack of cows of collective farmers as soon as possible." The expression is clumsy, but the meaning atoned for all literary flaws.

And soon the vocabulary of collectivization itself improved. The 7th Congress of Soviets of the USSR in February 1935 decided to proceed in such a way that "by the end of the second five-year plan there would not be a single collective farmer left who did not have a cow for personal use and small livestock."

But before that, the country had to go through a tragedy sky 1933. Year of hunger.

Then a lot was woven into one ... Under the knife about vocations have recently killed millions of cattle. The habit of collective work was not strengthened very much. Populist professor Engelhardt once wrote the famous book of letters "From the Village", where in his seventh letter he described a typical peasant household from several related families as follows

"Everyone knows how to work perfectly and really works perfectly when they work not for the yard, but for themselves. Each woman is looking not to overwork, not to do more than the other. Each washes *its share of the table* (*emphasis* mine. - S.K. ), behind which both

give."

**Dolku**, reader!

Many sons and daughters (think about it, reader , they are just *sons and daughters!*) of Engelhardt's "women" worked on the collective farm, neither

valko - "afraid not to overwork for a neighbor, even if they worked from morning to evening." It is not mine fiction, reader, but a quote from the seventh issue of the journal "Socialist Reconstruction of Agriculture" is just for 1933. By the way, I'll let you know that on December 31,

1928, at a meeting of the Politburo on the issue of "Report of Donugol and the Central Committee of Miners on the work of Donugol" said:

- The fact is that absenteeism is on the rise. The fact is that the trade unions do not conduct a direct open struggle against absenteeism, they do not come out openly. Recently there was a message from the Shakhtinsky district that there are workers who go to the doctor 25 days a month. At the enterprise they are considered heroes ...

This is also - from the peasant darkness, from the psychology of the "slices" of the people Vanek and Manek ... In 1921, the Russified German M.M. Gakkebusch, who left for Germany, published in Berlin under the pseudonym "M. Gorelov" book with the title "On the rivers of Babylonian: notes of a refugee", where it was written:

"... "The God-bearer" revealed his political ideals: he does not recognize any power, does not want to pay taxes and does not agree to give recruits. The rest does not concern him

there is ... "

Almost at the same time - on September 11, 1922, the writer Mikhail Prishvin, who lived in the village, wrote in his diary:

"... The peasant goes against the commune because he goes against the authorities..."

I meant - in general, against the "power"! Any...

Neither Gakkebush-Gorelov nor Prishvin were socially active people engaged in the transformation of Russia together with Lenin and Stalin. And they wrote not about Ivans and Marys, but about Vankas and Mankas ... But there were a majority of them!

And here came the drought. Not good... Especially in Ukraine, the then Volkogonovs and Radzinskys helped the elements - this was a convenient excuse to arouse dissatisfaction with Stalin. Everything that weakened Stalin was beneficial to Trotsky, even if it weakened the USSR.

And besides the Trotskyists, there were Socialist-Revolutionaries, monarchists, White Guards, nationalists, just saboteurs and, oddly enough, really agents of foreign intelligence services, who were waiting for their chance. The monarchical newspaper Vozrozhdenie wrote on March 28, 1930:

"It is necessary to think about how to take revenge on this bastard, and take revenge in such a way that not only howl, but so that the globe bursts in two upon hearing the groans of the Bolsheviks. Revenge, revenge and revenge, to extermination! And not here, abroad ... There, in the very nest of this bastard.

On April 18, the same "newspaper" repeated: "We need to do something now, without delay, to wish at least the end of the world, only to destroy the Bolsheviks."

Such a "revival" was prepared for us by the emigration. And in Russia itself, there were enough of her like-minded people and direct guarantors.

Vultures by nature, they immediately flocked to the killing field. Indeed, even during the famine in the Volga region of 1921, Bulgakov, a member of the Cadet "All-Russian Committee for Assistance to the Starving" (also known as "Prokukish" from the names of his co-chairs Prokopovich, Kuskova and Kishkin)

wrote in his diary: "Both we and famine are a means of political struggle." Then they managed to act openly, now they operated in secret.

But they acted.

However, the main reason was still inexpensive. People swelled up, ate quinoa and died. Died then millions.

And here again, the natural morality of the "natural intellectuals" could not be avoided. Tragedy was speculated then, and is speculated to this day. The English scientist Wheatcroft studied these years closely and came to the conclusion that the miscalculations of collectivization and the famine of the 33rd claimed about three million lives. This is already a lot. And this, obviously, is the true price paid in the end by the Russian people for their former social inertia, for darkness and

backwardness. But the "calves are many and fat", mentioned by Stalin once in 1917, surround historical truth, grind it into dust with their strong teeth, and the numbers are growing: 9 million, 18 million, 20 million "ruined and repressed". First - Stephen Rosefield, then - Robert Conquest ... Behind them - the Volkogonovs and Radzinskys of all sorts ... And what the hell for a Russian

intellectual that, according to Conquest's "statistics", it turns out that by the end of 1937 in the USSR behind bars, apart from criminals, there were supposedly every fourth man, and in the cities - every second.

So who, then, plucked the roses that had blossomed "in Chair Park" for young and not very young friends? Who provided the constantly growing birth rate?

Birminghamian Wheatcroft called his work "Another (! - S. K.) Steven Rosefield Cranberry",

and the domestic intelligentsia "bog", which was ridiculed by a young Russian Georgian in a gray overcoat in 1917, greedily pounces on this spreading "cranberry" and swallows it without grimacing. And he declares the dispossessed (whether it is fair or unfair) - a figure with a "typical fate for our people." Although for an ordinary person

more and more typical  
fate became certain, meaningful. Big... The  
intelligentsia

arrogantly declared itself the conscience of the people, but in fact that part of it that was hostile to the new government turned out to be just a bunch of people's political ignorance. The Russian people are a peasant people. And the Russian peasant has been weaned for centuries to be the master of his own destiny. And now, when Stalin and the Bolsheviks broke this habit, too many held **on to it out of habit**. Although behind the old were ignorance, hunger, foreign

strange bondage, doom and death...

The dullness of the peasants and kulak malice also had another high human cost: a quarter of a million kulak and middle peasant families went into exile. This is a lot, because this is the tragedy of one and a half million people. But this is not much, if you know that the future of the remaining ninety-nine percent was paid for by breaking one percent. Yes, and many of the same one percent. Among the memoirs of contemporaries of those events one can find demonstrative evidence. A descendant of the ancient princely family of the Gediminovichs, Sergei Golitsyn, after the revolution, remained with his family in Russia as a boy, died in 1989 and remained



tavil "Notes of a Survivor". Throughout his long life, Golitsyn, it seems, did not understand the essence of what was happening with his homeland - he did not want to understand it and judged the era like a layman. But it is precisely the sincere immediacy of perception that such lines of his are valuable:

"For the peasantry, the most terrible times were the last three months of 1929 and the first three months of 1930, when, as if under blows of axes, the centuries-old foundations, customs, and habits of the villagers collapsed. Brother Vladimir expressed the idea of a group of sadists who seized power, who brought the country to such a state that it seemed that it had rolled into an abyss. And there is no such strength to keep her ... "

Golitsyn, by the way, recognizes what has begun mass destruction of livestock by the peasants themselves.

So, in the perception of the Russian nobles, Princes Golitsyn, the Bolsheviks are a "group of sadists", and their politics is an abyss.

But the German nobleman, General Friedrich von Mellenthin, who was beaten by the Bolsheviks, assessed that era differently based on its

**results** . Let me remind you that he wrote: "Discipline is the main trump card of communism. It was a decisive factor in achieving Stalin's enormous political and military successes... The skilful and persistent work of the Communists led to the fact that since 1917 Russia has changed in the most amazing way. There can be no doubt that the Russian is developing more and more the habit of independent action..."

However, one should not lose sight of the fact that in the first period of collectivization, as well as in the later period of mass repressions, objective

processes, the historical necessity of which to ensure the future of Russia was undoubted, the forces hostile to Russia imposed a number of deliberately negative factors. Stalin knew about it. For example, here is a typical

for that time, the document was a top secret note sent to Stalin by the deputy chairman of the OGPU, Yagoda, and the head of the Secret Operational Directorate of the OGPU, Yevdokimov, on March 20, 1930 ... In this voluminous one, containing both specific facts and correct generalizations for

The letter specifically stated:

"Massive excesses and perversions in the course of collectivization and dispossession of kulaks in many districts of Siberia assumed alarming proportions. Incessant perversions cause serious fluctuations in the mood of the middle and poor peasant masses, which creates fertile ground for the deployment of kulak k[antr]-p[revolutionary] agitation and

to spread kulak influence on a part of the middle peasants and even the poor. <...>

It should be noted that in a number of districts (Achinsk, Slavgorod districts, etc.) massive bends and gross rotations were not only the result of

attention and distortion of the directives of the higher organizations - grassroots apparatuses, but were to a large extent the consequences of

I eat the wrong directives taught district organizations (RIKi and district committees) and authorized district organizations. <...> Here are a number of facts illustrating

the gross mistakes of the leadership. <...>

env. gave the following directive:

“ All property is subject to confiscation (from the kulaks. - S.K.) , with the necessary clothing and utensils left, excluding valuable utensils ...”

In with. Yarsky, Tomsk region secretary of the cell of the CPSU (b) arrested two poor people for speaking at a general meeting against the commune and spoke in favor of organizing c.x. artels...”, etc., etc.

And here are three specific figures whose names are but associated with the excesses of collectivization.

Iosif Vareikis - the son of a worker, at that time the first secretary of the regional committee of the Central Black Earth region ...

Karl Baumann, the son of a peasant who graduated from 1916 Kyiv Commercial Institute...

Mendel Khataevich, son of a merchant, in 1930 First Secretary of the Central Volga Regional Committee.

All three are Bolsheviks with pre-revolutionary experience, active participants in the revolution and the Civil War. And all three are active, cruel "benders" in the cause of collectivization, personally guilty of the fact that in their regions it was associated with unnecessary violence, the pursuit of interest, and the like... What motivated them ? Trotskyist views and plans? Perhaps... Vulgar moral decay and self-importance?

Obviously, and not

without that... Disagreement with Stalin and deliberate undermining of his authority and his policy? Perhaps it was

and such...

But it took time to deal with all this - after all, these were not obvious enemies, but old members of the Party, its professional cadres. In 1937, all three were shot. But in 1930, Stalin just pulled them back - for a stupid reti

vost.

The Golitsyn princes perceived what was happening as a doom, but they are already refuted by the statistics of the rapid growth of collective farm gross grain harvests with fewer people employed in the countryside. Russia still had to go through the famine of 1933, but it was the last mass famine in Russian history - the post-war famine of 1946 was no longer marked by such a horrendous number of starvation deaths as it was in 1933 ... In the second

half of the thirties, a base for cooperative large-scale commodity production of all types of food was created in Russia with good prospects for the development of this base. But already in the year 1930, burdened by excesses, in October, the OGPU intercepted and sent to Stalin a report from the English diplomat William Strang in London, where he reported, among other things, the following:

“... It is harder for the people now than it was a year ago, and they will probably have to endure a very difficult winter ... In some respects, many now live better than they did before the revolution, or at least have an idea of a better life. While before the revolution their table consisted mainly of black bread, cabbage and cucumbers, now they consider themselves

have the right to eat meat and butter and, if possible, get these products. Many now wear leather shoes, which was not the case before <...>

It does not seem that the five-year plan will collapse, although on the basis of information from the Soviet press itself, one can paint the saddest picture of its implementation ... Of course, something constantly went wrong somewhere due to high rates ... But, usually, in eventually the bugs are fixed. There is a lot of confusion, but, on the other hand, a lot of achievements. The Russians have the ability to achieve the implementation of huge plans solely due to their perseverance ... "

More recently, the tone of the reports of English diplomats Matov was different - maliciously condescending.

Now the West had to think: what would Russia be like under Stalin's leadership in the coming years?

HOWEVER, we should also be interested in the psychological side of the life of certain social circles, and therefore let us return to Prince Golitsyn once more. In 1929 he lived in Moscow and entertained his peers with foxtrot parties. A young, healthy, fairly educated guy. He was arrested but soon released. And before that, the investigator with sincere - in the words of Golitsyn himself - participation said to him: - I want to give you advice on my own behalf. Now all over the country began grandiose construction.

And you dance the foxtrot. You should join the nationwide creative process. My advice to you: leave Moscow for one of the construction sites, by hard work you will prove your commitment to Soviet power.

Golitsyn did not want to leave Moscow, and he started answering:

- But they won't accept me, I'm deprived, and even with such a social origin. "You will be restored to your voting

rights," the investigator answered with conviction. But how could such honest advice reach Gediminovich's soul, if he and

his friends at those foxtrot parties in 1929 amused themselves with the riddle of such "objective" charades: a tower of chairs was piled up to the ceiling, and then it collapsed. Everyone guessed the plan: "This is socialism

it's going."

Yes, they broke not only destinies, but also the psychology that was disastrous for the country. They broke both the arrogance of the princes of the ancient city, and the dullness of their former

smerds. "Psychology" was broken, and Russia received a large industry, a reliable base for the production of marketable grain and a new village. A peasant - with "God help her" rain - could sometimes produce in the twenties a record harvest better than the collective farm of the mid-thirties. But only the collective farmer ensured a steady increase in production. Ten years after the turning point of the 29th year, Soviet Russia already had such an agriculture and agricultural

engineering that the mortal starvation of its peoples was no longer threatened in any weather. For the first time in the history of Russia.

And only collective farms and Soviet power in a matter of The years have cleared the centuries-old manure from the village and brought the peasant youth out into the open spaces of the twentieth century. In 1917, sixteen-year-old Ivan Chistyakov, the future Colonel-General, Hero of the Soviet Union, came to St. Petersburg from the Tver village of Otrubenevo to help his uncle sweep the yard at No. 33 on Voznesensky Prospekt.

And ten years later, with a young paint, he was already studying Shaposhnikov's book "The Brain of the Army". At that time, a regular military man could not marry without the permission of the regiment commander. Comrade Chistyakova Lobachev received such permission without any problems: his pretty chosen one Tanya was from poor peasant women. The three friends went to the registry office, where a smiling woman handed the marriage registration book to the groom first: - Sign. With paint, Lobachev made a dashing stroke and held out a pen to the bride:

- Hold on, Tanyusha ...

And she just kept silent and blushed.

"Sign, citizen," the employee hurried impatiently, and Tanya burst into tears: "I ... I am illiterate ... That day the bride put three crosses

not only on paper, but also on her entire past life. At the end of the thirties, Chistyakov met again with his old friends, the Lobachevs. "Tanya," he recalled, "by that time already had a higher education, she graduated from the history department of the university

theta.

There was nothing of the sort in Trotsky's plans. And this, reader, is not an opinion, but a fact. Trotsky himself assured him, declaring in the Western press: "The opposition never undertook 'to overtake and overtake the capitalist world in the shortest possible time.' We thought of the socialist reorganization of the peasant farms only in the perspective *of decades*. This can be done only within the framework of an international revolution. We never demanded the liquidation of classes within the framework of the five-year plan of Stalin- Krzhizhanovsky ... "

Paint Chistyakov followed Stalin and became a Soviet general. The peasant woman Tanya went

after him - and became a historian. But such a peer of theirs, like paint Barmin, went after Trotsky. And he ended up turning from a graduate of the military academy, intelligence agent and diplomat into a "defector" and very soon into an open agent of the US intelligence services. Another of their younger contemporaries, Prince Golitsyn, chose the position of an outside observer, arrogantly looking at how his people were eliminating the consequences of the domination of Golitsyn's ancestors. Purebred, seemingly Russian, at a turning point in the history of the Motherland, he turned out to be spiritually alien to her. Until his death, he saw the era through its hardships and did not accept its accomplishments. But he also had to work at construction sites for five-year plans, go through the war as a geodetic engineer, receive orders and medals, write books for children ... In Tsarist Russia, Golitsyn would have lived his life

in clover - an idler or a semi-loafer. In Stalin's Russia, he had to, albeit reluctantly, become a hard worker. And this also affected the strength and correctness of Stalin as a people's leader and builder of the state. And so

why it doesn't need embellishment.

Accurate historical truth, extracted not from the "storage funds" that are dubious in today's "false archival" times, but from the visible deeds of the Stalin era ... The truth of fact and logic ... This is enough for Stalin to appear before us as the one who who he was in reality, that is, the greatest creator at the head of millions of creators, the most powerful patriot among millions of young Soviet patriots.

EVEN IN THE LATE 1920s, Stalin's enemies began to accuse him of suppressing dissent. And dey



Indeed, such a "freedom of thought" was severely suppressed in the country, which did not distinguish between violence in the interests of Capital and violence in the interests of Labor. To think **otherwise** in Stalin's Soviet Union was an unsafe occupation. But it is not meant that the desire **to think broadly and originally was not allowed or encouraged. And** just that was Stalin's style. He did not forgive superficiality and dishonesty, but he was always ready to respect genuine originality. A good example here is his

initiative towards Mikhail Bulgakov. In a difficult time for the writer, Stalin called Bulgakov himself and then helped him. But Bulgakov was hounded just

those Moscow intellectuals who recognized the only kind of diversity: the petty opinions of their own circle.

Among the persecutors of Bulgakov was Fyodor Raskolnikov, the future "refugee" ambassador and author of the famous "Open Letter to Stalin", and in 1929 the "bossy-indulgent" (the expression of Bulgakov's wife) chairman of the Artistic Political Council at the Glavrepertkom, who claimed, to the testimony of Elena Sergeevna Bulgakova again, to the laurels of Shakespeare, Moliere and Sophocles with Euripides, taken together. Intellectually and spiritually,

this layer, in which the Raskolnikovs flourished, was most often a literary offshoot of Trotskyism, but nationally ... Here are the critics of the literary magazine Krasnaya Nov, famous in the twenties:

Lelevich, Averbakh, Volin, Gelfand, Grossman-Roshchin, Gurshtein, Sergievskaya, Matza, Nels, Pikel, Nahamkes, Stetsky, Osip Betzkin, Pole, Gurvich, Brainina, Tager, Charny, Ramm, Meilakh, Hoffenschefer...

Azarkh, Gelfand, Nusinov, Kogan, Mats, Eikhenbaum, Foght, Dynnik labored in the journals "Press and Revolution", "Literature and Marxism". The editors of the "Young Guard" were

Averbakh and Kirshon. Critics G. Perekati-Pole (G. Kalmanson) and Gerbstman reviewed the poems in the journal On Post. There could also appear an article about Gorky with the title "Former Glavsokol, now Tsentrozh", or lines like this: "The battle is merciless, patron

new is not a pity and prisoners are superfluous.

And in the same place, a certain Sverdlova wrote this: "Counters bookstores obligingly offer a preschooler a book saturated through and through with an ideology alien to the proletariat. This is about Marshak's "Circus" and "Miracles" and "Murka's Book" with "Moidodyr" Chu kovsky.

"At the literary post" (in another "magazine of Marxist criticism") were Averbakh, Volin, Libedinsky and the lordly Raskolnikov. And literary analyzes were written by critics Galperin, Isbakh, Levin, Messer, Polyak, Serebryansky, Mashbits-Verov, Kogan, Zaprovskeya, Kor. And here are the assets of the RAPP and Literature and Art magazines: Raltsevich, Gurshtein,

Kronman, Aptekar, Usievich, Bochacher, Zivelchinskaya, Messer, Altman, Nusinov, Shupak ... The Ogonyok magazine was started by Mikhail Koltsov Fridlyand, another Friedland, photographer, and photo Count Scheikhet. Already in 1928,

Gabor published an essay from Berlin in the magazine "Prozhektor" with the title "In the camp of the enemy" ... And this "enemy" is about

to begin supplying equipment to the USSR for the industrial giants of the first

five-year plans.

And they write about Western Europe Ioffe, Yust, Kushner, Alsky.

Perhaps someone was tired of these lists... But how tired were many *in those years* of this mosquito fuss *around* the life and literature created by the talent of Mayakovsky, Sholokhov, Tvardovsky, Tikhonov, Bulgakov, Fedin, Tolstoy, Gaidar, Ilf and Petrov, Leonid Sobolev, Bagritsky... Among the delegates of the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, out of 582 Russian delegates, there were 243 people... Of these, 201

were Great Russians, 25 were Ukrainians, and 17 were Belarusians. There were 113 Jews. no matter where: out of 175 delegates of Great Russians - 91, Belarusians - 1, Ukrainians - 1, Jews - 57. Belarusian Francis Skorina and Great Russian Ivan Fedorov obviously missed the mark, doing the first printing

in Russian. It would be more correct to immediately master Yiddish ... For by the thirties of the twentieth century, the nation of Pushkin and Shevchenko, statistically

chesky gave in to the literary heirs of Sholom Aleichem dozens of times. It was who created the atmosphere of intolerance

and shtetlism, petty group fuss and group, factional connivance with "their own". Here is the layer that flickered around the case, and did not do it. In the late twenties and early thirties, this was not only the case in literature, but also in politics. They persecuted not only Bulgakov, but also Stalin. Later, many of those who hounded him would be famous.

catch him in such a way that even pointing someone at logging did not moderate the Judas "rapture" of wasps lurking...

The ill People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Chicherin, had already retired in 1929, or rather, he was pushed aside, even though Stalin believed that Chiche

rin must be left, even if he will work on  
two

hours. On March 22, 1929, Chicherin writes to Stalin from  
abroad:

"When I am writing to you now, I remember  
Roiseman (member of the Presidium of the  
Central Control Commission since 1924. - S. K.),  
Litvinov (future successor to Chicherin Meer  
Ballakh. - S. K.), Mif (leader of the Comintern  
Fortus. - S. K.), my pain is exacerbated  
immediately. If, instead of good workers, they  
impose on us the students of Lominadze, Shatskin,  
Semyonov (head of the Pravda publishing house.  
- S.K. ), I can only be a thousand miles away ... "

And this entire last list refers to the young guard of  
Trotskyism. In 1927, Chicherin expressed himself like this:  
"What is being done! Prostituted Narkomindel! Hooliganized  
Comintern! The Zinovievites direct the affairs. This is a  
look at the situation from the inside through the eyes of a  
knowledgeable person. Not Stalin, but Trotsky, Zinoviev  
and their ardent supporters made it impossible for normal  
working discussions about how best to **build** a country ,  
and not plunge it into external and internal adventures .  
And it was not the thirst for power, not intolerance, but the

legitimate feeling of a person who was up to his neck in  
practical work that forced Stalin to write to Molotov in July  
1929:

"The articles by Stan and Shatskin are either  
the stupidity of the editors of Komsomolskaya  
Pravda or a direct challenge to the Central  
Committee of the Party. Call the subordination of  
Komsomol members (and, therefore, party members) to

of the party's general line by "servicemanship" means calling for a revision of the party's general line, for loosening the iron discipline, to the transformation of the party into a debating club. Trotsky began his "work" with this. Zinoviev danced from the same stove. Bukharin chose the same path for himself. The Shatskin-Averbakh-Stan-Lominadze group is also embarking on this path. It is time to bring this group, which is straying into the path of petty-bourgeois (Trotskyist) radicalism, to order, because only in this way will it be possible to straighten out these young comrades and keep them for the party.

And here is a letter to Molotov, who is on vacation dated December 5, 1929:

"Hello Molotstein! Why the hell did you take it like a bear into a den and keep silent? Things are going well for us so far. Today we have decided to increase the inviolable food fund to 120,000,000 poods. We are raising supply rates in industrial cities like Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Kharkov, etc. You should already know about our external affairs. Business with China should go. It can be seen that our guys from the Far East really scared them (here we are talking about the conflict on the Chinese Eastern Railway, CER. - S.K.). Just received a telegram from Chang Xueliang. America and England and France, with their attempt at interference, were rather rudely shaved off. We could not do otherwise. Let the Bolsheviks know. I think the Chinese landlords will also not forget our subject lessons..."

A man's writing is his style, it is the man himself. And a person who knew how to write such letters is a good, spiritually healthy, energetic, but **very** busy person. Three weeks later he writes to Molo-

tov like this:

"Hello Vyacheslav! I know that in your heart you scold me for my silence. It cannot be denied that you have every right to do so. But come into my position: overloaded to the point of disgrace, there is no time to sleep (literally!) ... "

And there is no time to stand on ceremony if, in connection with the depreciation of paper money, nimble businessmen begin to buy up a silver coin, speculate with it and hide it. Pyatakov proposes to bring in additional silver from England, but Stalin recommends another method, the "testing scuffle."

Reader, I am not afraid to tell you these words of Stalin, because to apply such a method to those who walk with "merry feet" in the hours of people's difficulties - this is the highest humanism of a real people's political leader. After all, the worker simply does not have the opportunity **to buy and hide** . He spends money on living. Isn't it?

WHEREAS, Stalin always, all the time that he is on he was at the head of the state, there was time for everything ... Including literature, theater, art in general, and especially cinema. So, in the same

year of 1929, he was watching a film by Eisenstein, Aleksandrov and Tisse, a program for the then Soviet cinematographer, which at first had the name "General Line" and then, on the advice of Stalin, was called more modestly -

"Old and New"... By the way, Stalin "renamed" films more than once, and each time - successfully, for sure! Grigory

Alexandrov recalled the following about the "Old" and "new" in 1939:

"One afternoon, when Eisenstein and I were giving a regular lecture with GIK students, an attendant ran into the auditorium. He said that Comrade Stalin was asking us. In a moment we were at the phone. "Excuse me for interrupting your studies," said Iosif Vissarionovich. "I would like to talk to you, comrades. When do you have free time? Is it convenient for you tomorrow at two o'clock in the afternoon? .. "

When the next day the directors were in the Kremlin, Stalin told them:

- You, film workers, do not even imagine what a responsible task you have been entrusted with. Take seriously every action, every word of your hero. Remember that he will be judged by millions of people. You can't invent images and events while sitting in your office. We must take them from life - study life ...

At the end of the conversation, Stalin suggested changing the ending and remarked: "You need to travel around the Soviet Union, reconsider everything, comprehend, draw your own conclusions about everything ..."

The authors of the film "Old and New" traveled around the country on Stalin's trip for two months, and Aleksandrov admitted that when he made reports on the five-year plan of the Soviet Union in Berlin, Paris and London a few months later, he "really imagined the grandiose results , overlooked

already breathing in the contours of the construction of our country "...

While viewing the final version of the tape, someone threw a remark that its images were not sufficiently characteristic ... And Stalin objected to this that the artist outlines types and their images not only by simply transferring them into his work, but mainly by creating them. "Could Gogol," Stalin remarked,

"create now classical images and types — an eyebrow, a nose, a gait, the habits of one, an act or characteristic external features of another — and by mixing these features, by combining the most typical ones, create their own now already classical images..." Such a remark by Stalin shows not only a good knowledge of the history of literature, but also a subtle

understanding of the nature and methodology of artistic creativity. However, these Stalinist qualities were noted more than once by great masters of culture... He was able not only to

understand the essence of the work, but also to give accurate creative advice.

And it was always advice, not an order - although it also happened that those who did not listen to him received a beating. But it was not a lordly caprice either - Stalin was tough (but not cruel!) With artists when they depicted life politically incorrectly - which, I must say, entailed, as a rule, creative miscalculations. In this sense, the case of film director Alexander Dovzhenko and his film "Shchors" is typical.

The tape of the Ukrainian cinematographer has become a classic and deserves it. But few people know that the very idea of the film about the "Ukrainian Chapaev" was suggested by Dovzhenko Stalin.



Dovzhenko first met Stalin on April 14, 1934 in his Kremlin office. On November 5, 1936, in Izvestia, he recalled

it like this:

"I was prompted to turn directly to Comrade Stalin by the sum of the circumstances that had taken shape before the production of the film *Aerograd*. It was very difficult for me. And I thought: once, at a difficult moment in my life as an artist, I had already applied in writing to Comrade Stalin, and he saved my creative life and ensured my future creativity; no doubt he will help me even now. And I was not mistaken. Comrade Stalin received me exactly twenty-two hours after the letter was dropped into the mailbox.

Comrade Stalin introduced me to Comrades Molotov, Voroshilov and Kirov so warmly and well, like a father, that it seemed to me that he had known me well for a long time. And it became easy for me ... "

However, it must be said that Shchors did not come easy to Dovzhenko, also because Stalin very carefully and critically studied the script of the film and sought from its author the broadest possible political view of events. Stalin proposed the topic of Shchors to Dovzhenko after *Aero*

hail", but said:

My words do not bind you to anything. You are a free person. If you want to make Shchors, do it, but if you have other plans, do something else. Do not be shy. I called you to

you knew it...

Dovzhenko recalled:

"Iosif Vissarionovich told me this quietly and already without a smile, but with some special attention and care. Among the works of great state importance, Comrade Stalin found time to recall

artist, check his state of mind , ***remove from him the feeling of at least imaginary lack of freedom*** (emphasis mine. - S.K.) and give him complete freedom of choice ... "

Here is such a "tyrant" ...

The same "tyrant" initiated the development and adoption of a new Constitution of the USSR. At the same time, thinking about her appearance, he wrote to Lazar Kaga newcomer:

*"I have such a preliminary plan. The constitution should consist of (approximately) seven sections: 1) Social organization (about Soviets, about socialist property, about socialist economy, etc.); 2) State structure (on the union and autonomous republics , on the union of republics, on the equality of nations, races, etc.); 3) Bodies of supreme power (the Central Executive Committee or a body replacing it, two chambers , their rights, the presidium, its rights, the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, etc.); 4) Governing bodies (people's commissariats, etc.); 5) Court organs: 6) Rights and obligations of citizens (civil liberties , freedom of associations and societies, church, etc.); 7) The electoral system ... "*

It is characteristic that Stalin added: "*I think that a referendum should be introduced.*" The principle of a referendum

was introduced into the Constitution, and Stalin's opinion about the need for referendums proved that not only was he not afraid of the possibility of direct consultation between the authorities and the people, but he considered such a practice simply necessary in the future.

Today, in the Constitution of the Russian Federation, paragraph 3 of Article 3 of Chapter 1 "Fundamentals of the constitutional order" is also sieves:

"The highest direct expression of the power of the people is the referendum and free elections..."

However, as for "free elections", the current "Russian" "electorate" has already set its teeth on edge. Regarding the referendum, I can report that there is no current federal law on the referendum, which determines its procedure, in Rossiyanin. And the draft law, which was considered at one time, begins with the fact that it lists questions that can be submitted to a referendum ***more than once***

***is being decided.***

Here is such a "freedom"! Stalin...

On December

11, 1937, on the eve of the first elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, he spoke at the pre-election meeting of voters of the Stalin constituency in Moscow. The next day, his speech was published in Pravda, and for a modern reader, fed up with pictures of "Russian" election campaigns, to get acquainted with one fragment of this speech will, perhaps, be even more interesting than for the then listeners and readers of Stalin. He then said this:

“Comrades, I would like to give you advice, advice from a candidate for deputies to his electors... If we take the capitalist countries, there are some peculiar, I would say, rather strange relations between deputies and voters. While the elections are going on, the deputies flirt with the voters, fawn over them, swear allegiance, make all sorts of promises. It appears that deputies are completely dependent on voters. As soon as the elections are

If the candidates have turned into deputies, relations are changing radically. Instead of dependence on voters, they get their complete independence. For four or *five* years, that is, until new elections, the deputy feels completely free, independent of the people, of his electors. He can go from one camp to another, he can turn from the right road to the wrong one, he can

can get entangled in some machinations of a not entirely necessary nature, he can tumble as he pleases - he is not

hanging.”

Doesn't this remind the respected reader of something familiar to the point of disgust?

But that is not all!

Stalin also said the following:

“Can such a relationship be considered normal? No way, comrades! This circumstance was taken into account by our Constitution, and it passed a law by virtue of which The guardians have the right to recall their deputies ahead of schedule if they start financial

if they turn off the road, if they forget about their dependence on the people, on the electorate."

If only there was such a law, yes to the "electorate" of the "democratic" "Rossiyanin" - if the current "people's representatives" do not have Comrade Stalin ...

STALIN said at the 16th Congress of the CPSU(b): "We are 50-100 years behind the advanced powers. We have to cover that distance in 10 years or we'll be crushed ."

The 16th Congress is 1930, it is a congress "opened the offensive of socialism along the entire front.

The year 1930 minus one hundred years is 1830... Almost the Napoleonic era... Maybe Stalin went over the edge here? Well,

let the reader judge for himself, considering that even in Austria there were more industrial workers in the forties of the nineteenth century than in the Russian Empire in the most "peak" year for its economy in 1913. At the beginning of the

twentieth century, per capita spending on public education in Russia was twelve times less than in England ... The length of railways per capita is almost fifteen times less than in the United States. Moreover, Russian railways,

unlike European ones, were entirely single-track, and half of the steam locomotives were almost the younger brothers of the Cherepanovs steam locomotive (two of the three were built before 1880).

V. Gurko, already familiar to us, reported at the noble congress to the authorized representatives of the united noble societies:

"Without exception, all countries are ahead of us by several dozen times. annual production

the driving power of one inhabitant in Russia in 1904 was only 58 rubles, while in the United States it had reached 346 rubles fifteen years earlier." The intelligent, though often

limited, researcher of Soviet science Professor Lauren Graham from the USA wrote:

"The revolutions of 1917 took place in a country that was in a critical situation. In general, the Soviet Union was a backward and underdeveloped country, for which the speedy solution of the main economic problems was vital. As is often the case in underdeveloped countries, which still have a small stratum of highly educated specialists, the previous scientific tradition of Russia was predominantly theoretical.

ter".

Graham got here, as they say, "to the point." In 1913, Russian universities graduated 2624 lawyers, 236 clergymen and only 65 communications engineers, 208 railway engineers, 166 mining engineers, a hundred builders, together with architects. ramie.

And even engineers of factory production were added in the then Russia by only 1277 people. The current Yeltsinoid

"Rossiania" strongly idealizes *that* past... Is it not *in order* to provide the peoples of Russia with such "impressive" figures *in the future*?

Among the corresponding members of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in the category of physical sciences on

10 domestic names accounted for 38 (!) foreign ones.

But in terms of the category of historical and philological sciences, "ours" prevailed: 16 to 14. Well, to breed pseudo Russian intellectuals have always been much in favor of prehistoric and near-literary turuses on wheels ... These are the

digital additions to the opinion of the American Graham. However, this professor showed the

abilities not only of a scientist, but also of a card sharper, when he stated that the Soviet government allegedly inherited such a feature of Soviet science as an unusually large role of the central government from its tsarist predecessor. A little later we

we will see how the central tsarist government "supported" Russian science, and as for the young Soviet science, it must be said that in the first years of Soviet power, attention to science was more in words than in deeds, because otherwise it is not always enough funds. And although already in the

1920s science in the USSR was in a better position than in tsarist times, there were no forces for its serious development at that time. Nevertheless, below I will give a characteristic testimony of a prominent Soviet optician, a descendant of the Russified Swedes, Sergei Frish - by the way, the son and grandson of senators and the great-nephew of the Chairman of the State Council of the Russian Empire, never infringed under Soviet rule!

Frisch's teacher, Professor Bursian, grumbled immediately after the revolution: "Our commissars are yesterday's semi-literate workers. They think that every one of our scientists, if he is one of the former ones, will go over to the bourgeoisie. No, we will never be allowed to go abroad. We are doomed to a complete separation from world scien

However, from the beginning of the 1920s, long-term scientific trips abroad began. The example of

Rutherford's favorite Peter Kapitsa is only the most famous, but more than not unique. Frisch writes:

"In the second half of the 1920s, Soviet physics advanced rapidly and gained worldwide recognition in many directions. These successes were caused not only by the emergence of a large number of generously funded institutions, but also by the wide communication of Soviet scientists with all world science.

Frisch has already assessed the twenties as a rapid growth. But in fact, the qualitative leap occurred precisely in those years that the illustrious Golitsyn brothers perceived as the death of Russia. Whereas in 1929 there were 438 research institutes and their branches in the USSR, by the end of 1932 there were already 1,028. But this was only a running start. In 1929

the country had twenty thousand scientists, and after

ten years - almost a hundred thousand.

As early as 1928, the "father of Soviet physicists" Abram Fedorovich Ioffe, who enjoyed great prestige with Stalin, organized the First All-Union Congress of Physicists. Many foreigners also came to Moscow, among whom Dirac, Brillouin, Born, Debye shone ... After a week of Moscow meetings, the

congress moved by rail to Gorky, and from there it reached Stalingrad on a specially chartered steamer. The meetings continued on the steamer and in pain

in our university cities of Kazan and Saratov.



From Stalingrad by train moved to Ordzho Nikidze, and from there by car - to Tbilisi.

In Tbilisi, the congress officially closed, but the majority still went to the sea, to Batumi, and from there they began to go home. And in such a truly

holiday of thought, the really interested attention of the central government to the needs and problems of Russian science and scientists of Russia was manifested. That is, only in Stalin's Russia did the highest power — for the first time since the time of Peter the Great — begin to treat science and scientists as a national treasure. But two "scientists" -

Zhores and Roy Medvede - declare that science in the USSR "did not become ... heads

engine of technical and economic

progress" and that it allegedly was only "reviving" all the time, and the development of technology proceeded by copying what was achieved in other countries.

Well, firstly, in order to really save something rovat, and you yourself need to know and be able to do a lot.

Secondly, if one does not use Medvedev's "spoiled telephones" but knows the history of the development of science and technology, then one can understand that in the history of Stalin's Russia there is only one large-scale example of technical copying, which was not due to considerations of historical time *pressure* ( as in the Atomic Problem), but really breakthrough achievements of another power. I mean the "rocket" gap from the rest of the developed countries of the Third Reich, where Wernher von Braun and his employees achieved outstanding scientific and technical success already during the war by creating the V-2 ballistic missile. But here, everyone, including America, fell catastrophically behind the Germans. Moreover, the United States not only took the path of copying German technology, but could not do without the talent of von Braun at all.

Russia was brought into space with his employees - pupils of the Stalin era - Russian engineer Sergei Korolev. Yes, and the abbreviation relating to the first Soviet atomic bomb, RDS-1, was deciphered by its creators as "Russia makes itself", although another unofficial decoding was in circulation: "Stalin's jet engine."

But in the science and technology of pre-Stalin Russia - the royal position was completely different.

ELEVEN and a half years before the First All-Union Congress of Physicists, in January 1917, Professor Bogdanovich at a meeting of the Commission for the Study of the Productive Forces of Russia, created at the Imperial Academy of Sciences through the efforts of Academician Vernadsky, made a report "On the deposits of tungsten in Turkestan and in Altai.

There was a war ... Tungsten is a high-speed steel and, therefore, the possibility of doubling the release of shrapnel.

Bogdanovich ended with a message: -

So; gentlemen, to study Turkestan ores 500 rubles are needed.

- What about our request to the government? asked Professor Fersman.

- Recently received another answer - there is no money in the treasury. In fact, gentlemen, as you know, the government has been refusing us for two years now.

Reader! Bogdanovich did not make a reservation, and there is no typo here. Tsarism did not have FIVE HUNDRED RUBLES for the expedition. And according to the list of the state budget for 1913, the last Tsar of Russia, Nikolai I, received 16 million for the needs of the Ministry of the Imperial Court, and another 4 million 286 thousand 895 rubles "for the use known to His Imperial Majesty."

And this is not counting his income from personal lands.  
and others.

And that's just the king! But there was also a pack of grand dukes and other idlers from the "August family". This was the candidate of the

Rossiya TV channel for  
first place in Russian history... Bogdanovich

gleamed his glasses dejectedly, and then Academician Krylov, a mathematician and shipbuilder, stood up. In a firm and irritated tone at the same time  
but he said:

- As for Turkestan, everything is simple - here are five hundred rubles. To save the army, dying from lack of shells. - And Altai? Fersman did not let up. "It's

more difficult with Altai ..." Krylov thought for a moment, then he answered: "Karl Ivanovich did not indicate that the mines are located on the lands of the Grand Dukes Vladi Mirovich ... And suddenly he exploded: - What the hell is that!

The royal family

also seized the  
tungsten deposits beyond Baikal! This is where requisition or expropriation is appropriate ...

Silence squeezed awkwardly into the commission's session, but then, however, they moved on to another question. About five hundred rubles was recorded in the protocol, but about the dynasty ... This situation is

completely documented up to the dialogue ... So the American Graham was free to accuse Stalin of the "crazy pace" of industrialization and collectivization. The rates were determined by a simple calculation. Here is the year

1929 with its peasantry at the level of the last century and science, which has already left its former restlessness under the tsar, but has not yet become a major productive force.

And over there - the year 1939. A year, according to sober estimates, leading the world into the era of a new serious military confrontation. The difference is only ten years. During this period, it was necessary to go from a plow to the T-34 tank, the Il-2 attack aircraft and the BM-13 mobile rocket artillery systems, better known

nyh as "Katyusha".

And it was also necessary to come from the hem of a shirt instead of a handkerchief to the mass ownership of this technique, to hundreds of thousands of pilots, tankers, aircraft mechanics. Khanikov, radio operators.

So the stupidity was written by "scrutinous - as his some certify - a researcher in the history of Soviet science" Graham. The pace was taken wisely, but the tasks at such a pace had to be solved insanely complex! But we have to. And one can only be surprised at how keenly Stalin, with his only theological

seminary, the past of a militant, a professional exile and a runner from exile, understood the need for a powerful science for the country. I didn't understand it at all, but I understood it practically, **right now**. After all, scientific centers of the entire spectrum of knowledge did not begin to grow in the USSR on their

own! They were created according to the decisions of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the party more

nikov.

The same academician Krylov, who, like Fersman and Vernadsky, became a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, knew what he was saying when he said this:

"Russian science in the past did not enjoy the respect of the tsarist government. Then the lone scientist worked mainly

"to your science." The scientist is currently working on people: they solve the problems of gigantic construction, they create a new industry, new technology. For the first time in our country, a scientist has become a truly state active figure."

But who needed such statesmen? Trotsky? Zinoviev? They needed the leaders of a new revolution, a revolution at least on a European scale, and not domestic scientists in the field of fundamental and applied sciences.

No, it was not through the efforts of the Trotskyists that the resolutions of the Politburo of the Central Committee were prepared, which gave rise to academic institutions: Energy, Geological, Paleontological, Zoological, Institute of Chemical Physics, Botanical, Institute of Genetics, Institute of Geography, Institute of Plant Physiology, Physical, Institute of General and of inorganic chemistry, the Institute of Physical Problems, the Institute of Organic Chemistry, the Institute of Mathematics, Microbiology, the Institute of Fossil Fuels, the Institute of Biochemistry, the Colloidal Electrochemical Institute, the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology and Paleozoology... These are only new

institutes, only the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, only for five years, from 1930 to 1934. And behind this

brilliant list was precisely the Stalinist - ***personally*** Stalinist view of what

the country should deal with: discussions about the structure of the party or work under the leadership of the party. If only

such a view of domestic science would be given to the current "Russian" "leaders"!.. But why not given - not given ...

Pyotr Kapitsa stayed in Cambridge with Rutherford for thirteen years. In 1934, he was hinted from home "it would be time and honor to know." Let's give Kapitsa his due - he returned to the USSR and immediately became a major figure in theoretical and applied physics, director of the Institute for Physical Problems of the Academy of Sciences.

Here is how he wrote to Stalin and Molotov about the problems with the material base of these problems: "What kind of government are you if you cannot force

construction?" Tyrants do not forgive such vehemence, and Stalin did not object to *such* criticism, because behind it was not the petty pride of a poser, not the grumbling of an envious person, and not the gloating of a hidden enemy, but a businesslike desire to see new laboratories, installations, and workshops built as soon as possible. The desire to create a new science for a

new state. And in the name of the same goal, Stalin was able to see the difference between, say, Lev Davidovich Trotsky and Lev Davidovich Landau. The first one showed the cookies to Stalin, and the outside world saw the

cookies in the direction of

the USSR. And it was unforgivable. The second kept a fig to Stalin and Soviet power in his pocket. However, at the same time in Kharkov, at the Ukrainian Institute of Physics and Technology, founded in 1928, he was engaged in **construction, although of a special kind, but the s**

niya.

And this turned out to be enough for Landau, who was hostile to socialism, to continue working. In 1932, a

telegram from the director of the Ukrainian Institute of Physics and Technology (UFTI) Obreimov left Kharkov addressed to Stalin, Molotov, and Ordzhonikidze:

"On October 10, UPTI researchers were the first in the USSR and the second in the world to destroy the lithium nucleus by bombarding it with hydrogen nuclei accelerated in a discharged tube."

Yes, we were second, but after whom? The first proton accelerator in the same 1932 was built by the country of Newton, Maxwell, Faraday, Kelvin, Rutherford! In England, they knew how to appreciate the work of a scientist from a long time ago. However, neither the Anglo-Saxons Churchill and Roosevelt, nor, even more so, a series of French and German parliamentary politicians of that time could be compared with Stalin in the level of awareness of the prospects of scientific knowledge and its future place in the progress of society. A political

leader, he had here the accuracy of the view of the organizer of science, combined with the calculation smart industrial bigwig who knows that invested in science will always pay off with a vengeance. In fact, in terms of his masterful and deep attitude towards science, Joseph Stalin cannot be compared with any other historical figure in world history, except for Peter the Great and, naturally, Lenin.

But Peter lived at a time when Russia was forced to enjoy the fruits of someone else's scientific research... Peter had to take care not so much about science as about elementary education.

Lenin, himself possessing the qualities of a brilliant scientist, had only time to outline the approaches of Soviet Russia to science. And Stalin, on a daily basis, concretized, expanded and deepened these approaches, actually creating the scientific and technical basis for the construction of socialism.

Gediminovichi-Golitsyn "built" at this time chair pyramids...

Trotsky made plans to overthrow Stalin ... Stalin and the USSR simply built Stalin. It was not for nothing that Gorky created a magazine called "USSR at a Construction Site", where the editorial of the first issue stated:

"In order to deprive our enemies inside and outside the Soviet Union of the opportunity to distort and defame the testimony of words and figures, we decided to turn to the work of the sun - to photography. You can't blame the sun for distorting

yah, the sun illuminates what is, the way it is

There is..."

But both outside the USSR and in the USSR itself, there were many who could not agree with a place in the sun for the first power, created not by "heroes", but by the people. More precisely, it was created by the most outstanding builder of the great power in world history, Stalin, whose greatness also consisted in the fact that he perfectly understood: a hero can

succeed only by relying on the best forces of the people and serve him.

Could those who are accustomed to relying only on their own interest or on the interest of their masters agree with such a view? Of course not. And could they not oppose Stalin? Also, of

course, no. They

are, as the reader will soon see, and counter

were.

OCTOBER 1917 in Russia was quite logical, although it would hardly have been possible without the energy and drive of Lenin — he alone not only possessed an ideal understanding of the historical moment, but was



indisputable authority for the revolutionary masses, for the Bolshevik Party and for the leadership parties.

But October was still logical, if only because only the Bolshevik-Leninists steadily strengthened their position among the **conscious** masses! Manek and Vanek could be deceived, but Ivan and Marya more and more confidently followed the Bolsheviks. By the autumn of 1917, in all the elections in Petrograd and Moscow, the Bolsheviks, even under the Provisional Government, received not less than half of the votes, and among the garrisons even more than two-thirds!

Russia has really suffered - in Lenin's words - Bolshevism. In early March

1920, Lenin spoke at the All-Russian Congress of Labor Cossacks: - Socialist-Revolutionaries

and Mensheviks say that the Bolsheviks flooded the country with blood in the civil war. But didn't these gentlemen have 8 months for their experience? Were they not in power together with Kerensky from February to October 1917, when all the Cadets, the entire Entente, helped them? At that time their program was social transformation without a civil war... Lenin stopped, glanced attentively

at the listening hall, and then

continued: -

Today we have the right to say to these gentlemen: "Would there be at least one fool in the world who would go to the revolution if you really started social reform?" Understanding laughter went

around the hall, and Lenin waved his hand, and in the silence that came again it sounded again: - Why didn't they do it?

Because their program was an empty program, was

crazy dream. Because it is impossible to come to terms with the capitalists and peacefully subdue them, especially after the four years of imperialist war. How can one agree with this capitalism, which maimed 20 million people and killed 10 million?...

Lenin made a mistake then in one thing, because at that time there were no exact statistics of losses. Capitalism killed not 10, but 26 million people, of which 13 million lions - civilians. Neither in

Europe, nor in the USSR itself, the opponents of the new system wanted to see THESE figures. Someone simply showed a fig in his pocket at the same time. Someone had more serious intentions.

Professor Ramzin's "industrial party" was more than once declared an invention of the OGPU, and mining engineer Pyotr Palchinsky, who was shot in 1929, was declared "an innocent victim of the Stalinist terror" and merely an "ideologist of technocracy."

This is how Professor Lauren Graham from the USA writes about him. However, who prevented this "ideologist" from carrying out his supposedly beneficial ideas for the people in 1917, when Palchinsky was a deputy minister of trade and industry in the Kerensky government? Yes, and even earlier - when he led the capitalist syndicate "Produgol" and was closely associated with Russian and international banking circles.

But here's how he "technocratized" in 1917... On

May 5, 1917, a coalition ministry was created, which included Palchinsky. It promises control and even organization of production.

On May 16, the Menshevik-Socialist-Revolutionary Petrograd Soviet demanded immediate state regulation of production, and immediately Minister Ko

Novalov resigns, and Palchinsky begins to sabotage all control measures.

A catastrophic situation is being created in the

Donbass. Not the Bolshevik, but the pro-government newspaper

Novaya Zhizn reported:

"A hopeless circle — lack of coal, lack of metal, lack of steam locomotives and rolling stock, suspension of production.

Meanwhile the coal is burning

waters accumulate metal when where it is

you need it, you won't get it.

The Donetsk Committee, through the Soviets of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, organizes a questionnaire (only a questionnaire!) on the amount of metal. The industrialists complain, and Comrade Minister Palchinsky forbids "arbitrary control commissions." This "technocrat" does not appoint government commissions, but frustrates all attempts at accounting and regulation. The indignation is so great that Palchinsky is removed from the government, providing a "bread" place for the governor of Petrograd with an income of 120 thousand rubles. As such, Palchinsky organized the defense of the Winter Palace, placing cannons around it, offering them to the people

instead of oil.

It was this Palchinsky who became one of the first leading organizers of "professorial sabotage" and sabotage. In 1926 it was the "Union of Engineering Organizations", later the "Pro

thinking party. In the early

1920s, the Chekists carried out brilliant operations "Trust" and "Syndicate-2" to introduce their people into emigration circles. And just the "Trust" provided a secret trip to the USSR for the outstanding figure of the "white" movement Shulgin. He is not arrested

Vali, allowed to return to Europe, and in Berlin he published the book "Three Capitals" about his impressions of Moscow, Leningrad and Kyiv. Shulgin expected to see a dying country, but he saw "its undoubted resurrection" and admitted that in Soviet Russia "you quickly lose your disgust for life there, which is so characteristic of emigre psychology." However, many "technocrats" inside Russia are

disgust was hidden with difficulty and hoped for the return of the old in one way or another, but necessarily by force. In 1921, a lot of noise was made by a trip to the United States of the leaders of the so-called Trade and Industrial Committee, "Torgprom", which was formed under the Provisional Government - Pyotr Ryabushinsky, Gukasov, Lianozov, Denisov. "Torgprom" and other associations of industrialists tried to actively influence the processes in the USSR. Methods were chosen, of course, conspiratorial, secret. In the middle of 1918, representatives of Torgprom infiltrated the accounting committees under the State Bank, the Central Textile Industry Directorate of the Supreme Council of National Economy - Centrotextile. Then the Cheka worked quickly, but in May

1921, Pyotr Ryabushinsky said from the rostrum of the trade and industrial congress in Paris: - We are looking at our factories from here, and they are waiting

for us, they are calling us. And we will return to them, a hundred

ry masters, and we will not allow any control ...

Palchinsky remained in the country as one of those who were supposed to prepare this program "in the field." And Palchinsky and Ryabushinsky had no problems with personnel. Here is the class structure of students of Russian universities in 1914: children of nobles, officials and officers - more than a third, children of honorary citizens and merchants - a third. The rest -

these are the children of the philistines, the guilds, the peasants, the Cossacks, the clergy (every tenth), foreigners and "others."

In higher technical educational institutions "be laymen" made up a quarter, the children of honorary citizens and merchants - half of the students. Such was the case with those who were taught. And who taught them back in 1917? And here's who: at

universities, the teaching staff of hereditary and personal nobles, of officials and chief officers, accounted for 56 percent, and if you add honorary citizens with merchants, you get 64 percent.

Peasants and Cossacks came from 2.8 percent, while the sons of doctors, lawyers, artists, teachers and engineers were professors at a rate of only 4.7 percent. In technological institutes, higher technical schools,

and polytechnics, students from this last ("engineering") category were among the teachers, oddly enough, even less - only 4 percent. On the other hand, there were about half of the "white" professors (another 15 percent were provided by the merchants with honorary citizens, and a fifth by the philistines and guilds). Many of them did not want to cooperate with the "cattle" and instead of staying with Russia at a difficult hour, they emigrated. Although this was far from

everyone.

Their great-grandfathers, grandfathers, fathers and they themselves owed their well-being to the people, their sweat and blood. And when the time came to repay the debts, they arrogantly shied away, depriving the country of a large part of its educated stratum. If before the revolution there were 66 engineers working in the Lysvensky mining district alone, then in 1924 there were 91 of them in the entire Urals. Now much more depended on each engineer.

more than before. It could be of exceptional benefit, or it could cause serious harm. And here everyone has their own choice.

BTW, lovers of myths about the "atrocities" of the OGPU do not makes it difficult to recall the opinion of our famous

jurist Anatoly Fedorovich Koni. King horses

The royal authorities tolerated him only insofar as he was an outstanding lawyer. Born in 1844, by 1917 he managed to become a member of the State Council, a senator and a real privy councilor (rank II class), that is, a civilian general, holder of the orders of Anna and Stanislav I degree, Vladimir II degree, White Eagle and Alexander Nevsky. This was the highest class of official merit, but after the revolution, Koni did not doubt for a minute on whose side his

sympathies were. And he warned the Bolsheviks:

"You need iron power and against enemies, and against the excesses of the revolution, which which must gradually be dressed within the bounds of legality, and against themselves. And how many painful mistakes will there be. And yet I feel that in you really huge masses are coming to power.

Alas, not everyone had such an unconditional feeling for the Motherland as Anatoly Fedorovich. There

were just narrow-minded, confused people among the specialists. Mining technician Krasnyansky in the spring of 1927 wrote to the newspaper "Red Miner" of the Shakhtinsky District of the North Caucasus Territory: "We are not catching up with America, but on the contrary - in opposition to

we run the wrong side with the speed of an American train, we engage in self-deception. It was, so to speak, an "honest

panic." Although before the offensive (and things were moving towards the first five-year plan), alarmists were no better than traitors.

There were, however, simply traitors... In March 1928, the

North Caucasian Regional Committee of the Party

discussed the "Shakhty case" about sabotage in the coal industry.

The Shakhty process, which took place a couple of months later, was immediately regarded by many as "another thing of the Bolsheviks," but the chairman of the regional executive committee, Bogdanov, was not mistaken when he divided the old specialists into three groups: the first type - associated with the bourgeoisie and hostile to Soviet power, the second - who linked their fate and work with the Bolsheviks, and the third is the majority, the intermediate mass, which hides its convictions and works for bread.

Well, the assessment is sober and without hysteria. The main thing is that the assessment is correct in the sense that the first type, alas, it really existed.

No one at the meeting of the regional committee mentioned above was going to blame all sins on sabotage. Evdokimov, the authorized representative of the OGPU for the North Caucasus, reported: "In 1926/27 operational years, there were 6213 accidents that occurred in the mines of the Shakhty District.

body acts".

In total, only every twelfth case was explained by sabotage. And he was most often not a fiction ... Ilf and Petrov well described the mood of the "former"

at that time. Interventions were expected from hour to hour in the belief that "the West will help us." And it wasn't just literary. Here is a quote

from the transcript of the same meeting of the regional committee: "At the last stage, they became so insolent, so confident that intervention was imminent, that they decided to be more active in preparing for the overthrow of Soviet power."

Well, it sounded convincing. For example, in the Don Bass, Chekists found a note from the owner of a coal mine, real State Councilor Paramonov, marked ... "on the 2nd day of June 1919" in the possession of the arrested engineer Pavlenko.

"Dear sir Vasily Petrovich! - the owner wrote to Pavlenko. "In the event that the mine is captured by the Bolsheviks, I ask you not to leave the enterprise, by all means take care of the preservation of mines, machines and inventory ..."

The State Councilor in 1919, in the second year of the Civil War, clearly counted on a speedy return, but the wait dragged on. It turned out that before overthrowing the Soviets, it was necessary to shake them up. And now the issue is not about preservation, but about damage to equipment. But why did engineer Pavlenko

keep the old note for so many years? Of course, he kept it as a kind of password in case of a successful intervention. Well, indeed, it was not for the collection that engineer Pavlenko kept this unsafe document somewhere in a cache for ten whole years! Yes, as the situation became more complicated—and it

became more complicated because huge new changes were brewing in the country—not only the Bolsheviks, but also our internal enemies, became more and more active.

Here there could be individual mistakes, but in the general mood of many "specialists" it was no longer possible to make a mistake. And the matter was not limited to "moods"!



So, from November 25 to December 7, 1930, an open trial of the "Industrial Party" was held in Moscow. They judged people who were

prominent in the USSR. Professors Kalinnikov and Larichev were members of the Presidium of the State Plan of the USSR, Professor Ramzin was the director of the Thermal Engineering Institute. According to the "torgprom" tradition, it was not without major leaders from the Organizing Textile of the Supreme Council of

National Economy. The defendants have been on business trips abroad more than once, and the opportunities for contacts they had enough acquaintances from emigration.

The topic of possible intervention was central to the process. Professor Ramzin said: - Our main bet was on intervention against the Soviet Union, because only intervention was recognized as a sure and quick way to carry out a counter-revolutionary transfer

company...

Yes, one could not count on a coup without intervention, just as without an internal coup, external intervention was doomed even before it began, because, although the propertied classes of the Entente passionately desired the fall of Soviet power, the popular masses of France and England in the march on Moscow would not go. There was only one thing left: to act through

the hands of Poland, Romania, the Baltic "limitrophes" and the forces of the white emigration. And this option was quite real, because every possible participant in the intervention was in the pocket of the Entente. In addition, each of these clients of the Entente and the United States had their own plans in the USSR.

The world economic crisis of 1929 hit Poland very hard, and the war could

"let off steam" (not to mention Kyiv - the sweet dream of the White Poles). The

Romanians constantly feared the loss of Bessarabia occupied by them, and would also support the intervention.

Limitrophes were not of great importance, but they would not be superfluous.

One can not speak about the mood of the officer emigration. So

there was a chance. But it is necessary - with a serious internal conspiracy. So the OGPU

how it could not have been invented just because here the Chekists were clearly ahead of the special services of the West.

Ramzin admitted: -

From direct technical sabotage, the center quickly went to "planned" wrecking, which boiled down to such methods of planning individual sectors of the national economy that would artificially slow down the pace of the country's economic development, create a disproportion between individual sectors of the national economy ...

This was said at the end of 1930—only a year after the start of the first five-year plan. It was not yet the time to count its successes and miscalculations, and Stalin did not need to explain the failures as sabotage. It was not at all convenient for Stalin to discourage the people by "inventing" reports that "mines" of planned sabotage were laid in the five-year plan already at its creation. After all, the first thought at the same time would be: "Is it necessary to carry out such a plan?"

That is, Ramzin spoke the truth. And this is confirmed by one letter from Stalin, which - wow! - "Russian" falsifiers of history are interpreted as evidence that Stalin allegedly

invented "testimonies" to be obtained from those arrested in the case of an allegedly non-existent party. But this letter from Stalin to the chairman of the

OGPU Menzhinsky dated October 1930 proves the opposite, namely that the Industrial Party was a reality and that the testimony of its leaders was not invented in the Stalinist office. Stalin's letter was caused by the following ... Descriptions of the activities of Ramzin and his colleagues (transcript of the

process and materials attached to the case) amounted to

a decent book and were published in Moscow in 1931. And the materials of the investigation were generally multi-volume, and behind this mass of testimony and details, the main political moment could easily slip away. The situation did not allow the process to be delayed, and the investigation grew. The specific details of the internal conspiracy were more important to the Chekists, but Stalin, as a politician, as a responsible leader of the

country, was naturally interested not so much in appearances as in the general plan of the conspiracy, the core of which was external intervention. With the idea of the need for such an "outwardly political" approach to the investigation, Stalin and

wrote:

"Tov. Menzhinsky! Letter

dated 2/X and materials received. Ramzin's testimony is very interesting. In his opinion, the most interesting thing in his testimony is the question of intervention in general, and especially the question of the timing of intervention. It turns out that intervention in 1930 was supposed, but postponed until 1931 or even 1932. This is very likely and important. <...> Maybe

it seems that the TKP (Labour Peasant Party. - S.K.) or the "Industrial Party" represents the main force. But this is not true. Home ... "Torgprom". force - TKP, "Industrial Party", Milyukov's "party" is boys running errands at Torgprom. The more interesting information about the period of intervention coming from Torgprom. And the question of intervention in general, of the duration of intervention in particular, is, as we know, of paramount interest to us..."

As you can see, above we are talking about already available testimonies, about real plans for intervention ... But the "Russian" "historians" blame Stalin for the following part of his letter:

"Hence my proposals: a) To make one of the important key points of the new (future) testimony of the leaders of the TKP, the Industrial Party, and, especially, RAMZIN, the question of intervention and the period of intervention (1. Why was the intervention postponed in 1930? 2. Is it because Poland is not yet ready? 3. Perhaps because Romania is not yet ready? 4. Perhaps because the limitrophes have not yet closed with Poland? 5. Why was the int-tion postponed until 1931? .? 6. Why "can" they postpone it until 1932? 7. Etc., etc.) ... b) Involve Larichev and other members of the

Central Committee of the "Industrial Party" in the case and interrogate them most rigorously about let them read RAMZIN's testimony. <...>

If RAMZIN's testimony is received under confirmation and concretization in testimony

other accused ..., then this will be a serious success for the OGPU, since we will make the material obtained in this way in one form or another the property of the sections of the Communist Party and the workers of all countries, we will conduct a campaign against the interventionists and we will achieve that we will paralyze, we will undermine attempts to intervene for the next 1-2 years, which is important for us. It's clear? Hello! I. Stalin.

*This is what this letter is*

*like...* But from its context it is clear that Stalin's proposal to make the issue of intervention and the timing of intervention one of the important key points of the new (future) testimonies of the top of the Industrial Party is an instruction not to falsify such testimonies (Stalin's letter shows that evidence of intervention already existed), but only to shift the emphasis in the investigation from operational issues to the aspect of intervention ...

It would seem that everything is obvious! But now, from this letter, which I quoted almost in full, releasing only those parts where Stalin speaks about the Lianozov-Nobel group and the leadership of the TCH, "Russian" "historians" make an indictment for Stalin "evidence".

N-yes...

The conspiracies of the old specialists were, alas, a reality, because there were external forces directly interested in them. The Ryabushinskys, Palchinskys and Ramzins have been sitting at the same tables and breathing the same atmosphere ever since their "former" life.

There was a time - they were all like-minded people. Ten years have passed, and some old specialists have broken their old ties, while others have kept them.

The well-known book graphic artist Yevgeny Kibrik, as a young man, illustrated the famous "Cola Breugnon" by Romain Rolland in 1936. At the World Exhibition in Paris in 1937, these illustrations received a silver medal. And in the spring of 1931, Kibrik came with a creative propaganda brigade of the Central Committee of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League to the construction of the Bobrikov chemical plant on Valdaiskaya

hills.

Bare gray plain, wind, gloomy landscape with unfinished gas tanks. Muscovites were met by the Komsomol secretary of construction - a small, cheerful black guy with torn off hands. Forked bones of the forearm - and for

food, and for writing, and for a "handshake". It

was this secretary who told me that the design of the combine had been drawn up in such a way that the factories were being built, and the power station had already been commissioned for them. The construction site near the Sotsgorodok of chemists was cut down cleanly, and the nearest tree was three kilometers away. Yes, and he lost his hands in an accident, the origin of which was clearly wrecking.

This was the method of work of Ramzin's colleagues. They are for put in the projects of the workshops expensive marble floors ly, and in response to bewilderment they answered that, they say, but your worker should work in palaces. It was really a "professorial" class of subversive work. Somewhere it was smart enough

to replace marble with cement, but in some places it did. A minority of a hundred

went against the new Russia ryh specialists - about one out of a dozen. But others were also suspect.

eleven. Some of them ended up under unjust arrest. But here is what Jawaharlal Neru wrote from a British prison in Indian territory to his young daughter Indira Gandhi:

"There is an old Russian proverb: "Fear has big eyes." It is remarkably true, whether we are talking about babies or countries and societies. The nerves of the Bolsheviks are always tense, and their eyes widen at the slightest provocation, because the imperialist countries are trying in every possible way to destroy communism, undertaking all sorts of maneuvers and intrigues for this purpose. The Bolsheviks often had cause for concern, and yes

but inside the country they have to fight  
deal with numerous attempts  
Botage..."

Yes, the dull, and even open anger of bourgeois specialists against the Soviet government was born on the same day as Soviet Russia. And immediately took the form of direct infamy. What was the cost of one strike proclaimed by the Pirogov Society in 1917! Great surgeon in a coffin, probably a coup

he huffed, watching his name being denigrated by those to whom the very profession prescribed **compassion**. And the doctors of Moscow and Petrograd went on strike already on November 22, 1917 - half a month after the October revolution. And

sabotage was not limited to doctors. In the autumn of 1918, a prominent Cadet, Professor Kartashev, said in Helsingfors (Helsinki): "We are no longer the Cadets who once released power. We can be cruel."

Who, then, was going to be cruel in the composition of, say, the Kadet underground "National Center" on the territory of the RSFSR? Quite civilized people: engineer Steininger, co-owner of the Voss and Steininger patent office, professors Kotlyarevsky, Muravyov, Ustinov, Sergievsky, Muralevich, Kapterev, Feldshtein, former trustee of the Petrograd educational district Vorontsov...

Professors-economists Pletnev, Bukshpan, Kafengauz were only "technical experts" of the center. This "National Center" was

preparing the surrender of Petrograd to Yudenich. And he had a chance - large military men who served in the Red Army participated in the conspiracy: Admiral Bakhirev, head of the land department of the headquarters of the Baltic Fleet, Colonel Mediokritsky, chief of staff of the 7th Army, Colonel Lyundekvist, head of the air squadron Eremin. Professor of the Technological Institute By

cov.

We know Koltsov, the director of the Institute of Experimental Biology, as a geneticist who "injured" in the late thirties. And in 1920 he was the treasurer of the "National Center", the owner of a safe house and a turnout for couriers Kolchak and Denikin. Engineer Zhukov was preparing

explosions on the Penza-Ruzaevka railway in order to prevent the transfer of troops from the Eastern Front to the Southern.

The whole world knows about the scientific prizes of Alfred Nobel. But in 1918 there were other "Nobel" prizes. Before leaving Russia, Gustav Nobel, a member of the board of the joint-stock company of oil enterprises "Nobel", appointed them as Russian employees of the company for sabotaging instructions.



Russian power and economic espionage. Among the "laureates" were Professor Tikhvinsky, Glavneft's laboratory assistant Kazin, Istomin, head of Glavneft's technical department in Moscow, and Zinoviev, chairman of Glavneft in Petrograd. Financing

and "awarding" of prizes was interrupted only with the disclosure in 1921 of the conspiracy of the "Petrograd Combat Organization". It was led, by the way, by Professor Tagantsev, a former member of the National Center. So the later coal

"Shakhtinsky case", the fish "Astrakhanshchina" and the vast "Industrial Party" had deep, strong roots.

In the autumn of 1929, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR was purged. Approximately one hundred (out of approximately one and a half thousand) employees were fired, some were arrested. Among those dismissed, not all were scientists, and this purge could not be compared with the dismissal of more than a hundred university professors by the tsarist Minister of Education, Casso, seventeen years

earlier, in 1911. But even in 1936, not all academicians voted for the expulsion from the Academy of the emigrated chemists Ipatiev and Chichibabin. These two, having become outstanding masters of their craft, never became Russian patriots. People like them represented the remnants of that "white-lining" layer, which always remembered its nobility more than its duty to the people of the Motherland. Even

the outstanding Russian mathematician Luzin, to whom science in the USSR owes a lot, in the thirties published two thirds of his works in ... French. It ended with a gentle hint to him: they say, your ideas, academician, will not become less attractive if they become known to the world in the language of their native aspens.

Yes, everyone chose his own and got his own. But even when receiving an "OGPU ticket" to, say, the Belomorkanal system as a prisoner, a pest engineer to windows. At the beginning of the construction of the canal, he could become not only a free man, but also an order bearer, again a major leader. The fate

of many turned out to be such, including the fate of Professor Ramzin. Condemned to the execution of arrows, he was pardoned. At first, he was engaged in scientific work in prison, then he was released. Ramzin was a really great scientist, he received the Order of Lenin and the Stalin Prize, but the "industrial party" pages of his life were written by him, and not by Stalin.

Stalin, together with Russia, wrote her new history. There were many mistakes, blots, strikethroughs, clumsiness and blots on the pages of this story. However, these pages, where the chronicle was interspersed with reports, where the momentary was mixed with the eternal, and the naive with the innovative, were read by the whole world.

There were no indifferent or condescending to the beginning of the thirties. Both friends and enemies understood better and better that Stalin's Russia seemed to be serious. And

more and more often, both those and others were worried and the collapsed, albeit for different reasons.

Moral sabotage turned out to be NO BETTER than direct industrial sabotage. The former horse guards officer Georgy Osorgin in the "NEP" years was engaged in repurchase. Accepted from acquaintances - "former people" - jewelry, gold and resold to Jewish brokers. His

acquaintances considered him an "impeccably honest" person: he took "a certain percentage" and "not cheating

whined." When asked why he - an officer, a nobleman - is engaged in mamlachestvo, Osorgin answered proudly:

- I swore allegiance to the sovereign emperor, and the Soviet I don't want to serve the government.

In the late twenties and early thirties there were plenty of such osorgins. They considered themselves Russians, but instead of helping the new Russia to get on its feet, they stupidly and petty preferred to servile "on the hook" of shady Jewish businessmen. And those who built this Russia and were obliged to think about its security more and more often had a reasonable thought: "What if tomorrow smells of gunpowder? How will these former horse guards behave? After all, they do not consider themselves any moral obligations to the USSR, they do not consider it their homeland.

On March 20, 1935, the NKVD decree was published:

"In Leningrad, arrested and deported to the eastern regions of the USSR: 41 former princes, 32 former counts, 76 former barons, 35 former large manufacturers, 68 former landowners, 19 former large merchants, 142 former royal dignitaries, former generals and officers of the tsarist and white armies 547, former gendarmes 113. Some of them are accused of espionage."

Thousands of people were expelled. Some - to Kazakhstan, some - only to Saratov and Samara. Cruel?

Well, in

relation to these "thousanders" and those three thousand members of their families who left with them, it's really not very kind. But after all, such a question is also legitimate: "What about those tens of millions with whom these you

Thousands did not feel themselves in national and spiritual kinship? Indeed, out of these four thousand, hardly anyone sincerely considered himself a citizen of the Soviet Union. Like

the horse guard Osorgin, these thousands of *former* Russians considered themselves fellow citizens not of tens of millions of Russians living in Russia, but of those, also *former* Russians, who in the thirties ironed the asphalt of rue Richelieu and Place Pigalle while driving a Paris taxi or taught in emig

Rant cadet corps military science to those children of *former* Russians who were to go to war against Russia in order to win back from a million

new lost privileges for thousands...

Those who were expelled, their "impeccably honest" relatives and friends, always took for granted the hereditary brilliance of the minority and the hereditary vegetation of the rest. But these "others" also had the right to a decent life, that is, the majority to whom tsarist Russia denied such a right from generation to generation.

But, perhaps, in the eighteenth year of Soviet power, the "former" thousands no longer posed a danger to the "remaining" one hundred and seventy odd million citizens of the USSR?

Alas, very many of these "former" have harbored muffled malice and thought about the future with the hope of returning the past. And even if they did not even strive for a return, they were still harmful to the country with their claims to be chosen, to have a special understanding of life. Although they did not understand anything - on both sides of the Russian border. A relative of the Horse Guardsman Osorgin, the writer Mikhail Osorgin, was expelled from Russia in the spring of 1922 with a Soviet passport. He lived with him, wrote books, corresponded with Gorky, asked to be returned.

What

for? In 1936, a year after the Leningrad "exodus of the former," Gorky wrote to an old (since 1897) friend in Paris:

"The time is now fighting, and in war, as in war, one must take a place on one side or another of the barricade."

Osorgin replied:

"Against fascism, which positively seizes all of Europe directly or indirectly, one can fight only by preaching real humanism ... My place is invariable on the other side of the barricade, where the private and free public fights against violence against them, no matter what this violence may be. was covered, no matter how good words mi justified themselves. My humanism is ready to fight for man. By myself I'm ready for

I don't want to sacrifice, but I don't want to sacrifice a person. Better let the future go to hell."

However, neither Stalin nor Russia was going to send their future to hell and were not going to allow anyone to do so.

Osorgin stubbornly did not want to see that his "barrikada" stood **across** life and the struggle for man. But was it really that harmless? If he had returned to the USSR, he would have got in the way at first. And then?

And then...

No, it was not worth experiencing another confusion ka-intellectual on fidelity to the idea of real socialist construction. After all, Osorgin wrote arrogantly in 1936:

"You have found the truth. The one that thinkers have been looking for for thousands of years. You found her written down, memorized, elevated to dogma and forbade anyone to doubt it to be.

It is comfortable, warm, suitable for bourgeois well-being. Paradise with reservations, on the gates there is an icon of a miracle worker with a mustache.

Osorgin wrote like this:

"Your scientific backwardness is striking. Russian scientists are typical high school students. I look through academic publications and marvel at their smallness and naivete.

Firstly, I don't know what the writer Osorgin could understand when he leafed through Uspekhi fizicheskikh nauk or some other specialized scientific journal? In second ones...

Secondly, did the new Russia need this "cadre" literary "fighter for man" who assured Gorky that he "believes in the Soviet youth no less than him and expects a lot from it"? Osorgin, a Parisian emigrant, built his

barricade across life... And the young Muscovite, aircraft designer Sasha Yakovlev, excited by the approval of his first "real" UT-2 aircraft, at that time smiled and looked into the lens of the photographer, who poked his tripod apparatus in turf Tushin

airfield.

And on Yakovlev's shoulder lay the hand of the one

standing behind... Whom? According to Osorgin - "a miracle worker with a mustache." And according to Sasha, Comrade Stalin. His older friend...

And this comrade did not just *expect* a lot from the Soviet youth. He raised her, nurtured and supported her sovereign undertakings. Therefore, not

only Yakovlev considered Stalin a comrade, and not only those who, full of youthful enthusiasm, surrounded Stalin on that slightly cloudy, but still joyful and cheerful day.

Millions of people in Russia called Stalin their comrade and sincerely considered him as such. At the same time, from year to year, the number of these millions

does not

decreased, but grew and grew.

And NOW I will touch on a completely different side of the life of Stalin's USSR. How much was said later about Stalin's alleged eradication of the spirit of freedom in Russia. Let's try to look at this well-established myth from an unusual angle. Any specialist in child psychology knows that the foundations of personality are laid by the age of five or six. Does not disagree with science and folk wisdom: "Educate while lying across the bed. Lie down - you can't straighten it out anymore. "

You can straighten it out later, but with what difficulty! And, in any case, by the age of twenty, a person is basically "molded". Isn't it? And if so, let's take on thesis

number two ... The symbol of an inquisitive ruff, not accepting

proclaiming, a symbol of attitude to the world, as to home, where the main thing is the feeling of the master of life, became the famous "sixties", who themselves called themselves "children of Khrushchev's "thaw" ...

"Set the table on Vosstanya Square," after all, this is a large-scale poetic "order" for a specific composition of "companions": Voznesensky, Rozhdestvensky, Yevtushenko, Akhmadulina.

But the "sixties" are not a group or even a stratum. It really is **a generation**. The generation of the Moscow Festival, the songs of Vizbor and Pakhmutova ... The generation of the Gagarin spring, the Bratsk hydroelectric power station, the young poems of the same Yevtushenko, Voznesensky, Rozhdestvensky, the films of Khutsiev, Muratova, Shepitko, the fiction of the Strugatsky brothers and Ivan Efremov ... In the early sixties, this generation was thirty years old. So, the birth of

about the thirtieth - thirty-third years. If we are to believe the slanderers of Stalin and the era of Stalin, the foundations of the personality of these future "uninhibited carriers of the

new consciousness" were laid "under the groans of the prisoners of the Gulag", "the roar of the crowd welcoming the "Moscow trials", and "the creak of the boots of the "executioners of the NKVD", without exception. -de arresting whole

quarters.

Moreover, by the day of Stalin's death, that is, by March 5, 1953, these were already twenty-year-old boys and girls, whose whole life, from the first cry to the first and - not very first kiss, passed exclusively in the Stalin era!

So where, one wonders, then do they have non-standard thinking and looseness of feelings? And didn't the energy of new songs actually form them, didn't it sink in from kindergarten: "We have no barriers at sea and on land", "We were born to make a fairy tale come true", "For a just cause, you proudly and boldly go, without fear of anything!", "Who is used to fighting for victory, let him sing along with us"? ..

After all, this generation of the future "sixties" was one of the first to learn "Baggage", "Who to be?", "Scattered from Basseinaya Street", "Uncle Styopa" and "Cockroach", "Mr. Twister" and "Moydodyr" ...